

GUSTAVUS GEORGE ZERFFI, 'SCIENTIFIC HISTORIAN'

by

TIBOR FRANK

A growing interest is being shown to those Hungarian refugees of the revolution and War of Independence of 1848 and '49 who, right after the suppression of the War of Independence or after a politically active period in their emigration, took to a scholarly career.¹ It was to this group of emigrés that, in the last period of his life, G. G. Zerffi belonged. Gustavus George Zerffi (1820—1892) had a contradictory career the scholarly part of which, for all its intriguing art-historical, historiographical as well as international aspects, has been ignored by Hungarian historians up to the present time.²

In recent years, a number of facts about Zerffi's activities before and during the revolution have been revealed, mainly by Hungarian literary critics. He started his career with German writings, then he tried to become known as an adversary of Sándor Petőfi the poet. A staff writer on the Hungarian periodical *Honderü*, then on the *Morgenröthe*, young Zerffi gained a degree of fame as a conservative journalist, critic and editor. Apart from his own writings, he also published literary translations.³ Even before 1848 he had often been referred to as a chameleonic "Pechovich" (= systematic turncoat), and "only March 1848 could wash him clean of the black and yellow spots of the disreputable *Honderü* and the yet more disreputable Lázár P. Horvát." He went over to the revolutionary side. He translated the *Nemzeti Dal* (National Song) by Petőfi into German, he was an active journalist editing the papers *Reform* and *Der Ungar*, and he also became an active member of the radical Egalitarian Society, and was even elected to its Board. In the Society, he gave revolutionary addresses, demanding, among other things, national independence.

At the turn of 1848—49, when the troops of Field-Marshal Windisch-Grätz were marching on the capital, he escaped with his family to the Great Plain of east Hungary. From January 1849, he took part in the War of Independence. In mid-February he obtained a captaincy, and in spring he started out for Pest with the main bodies of the "honvéd" army, as an aide-de-camp to General Lajos Aulich, commander of the

2nd army corps. After the battles in the Great Plain, he became first adjutant to General József Schweidel, Governor-General of Pest, who described him as "efficient and assiduous". At the end of the War of Independence we find him at Komárom, and later in Szeged. From there, after the collapse of the War of Independence, following in Kossuth's footsteps, he escaped to Turkey. In mid-September he was "indicted for active participation in the armed rebellion in Hungary" and "a warrant was issued for his arrest". With a new turn, however, he almost simultaneously joined the international network of agents of the Austrian Ministry of the Interior. For more than fifteen years he continued to dispatch to Vienna his numbered spy-reports on the activities of the international (and especially of the Hungarian) communities of expatriates, first from Constantinople (1850–51) and Paris (1851–53), and subsequently, from the early spring of 1853, from London, the city where he settled down for the rest of his life.⁴

In the 1850s, over and above the payment he received from Vienna, Zerffi earned his bread teaching German and German literature in London. He had teaching jobs at the *Royal Medical College* in Epsom, at *Westbourne College* in Bayswater, in the metropolitan evening classes at Crosby Hall, in the *City of London College*, and in *The Elms and Park House Ladies' College*. In 1862 he became naturalized. When his links with Vienna were finally severed in early 1865, he left behind his disreputable livelihood. According to one of his letters dated 1881, he had also been lecturing on history from the second half of the '50s, a period when several of his fellow-countrymen shared his interest in this discipline. In the late 1860s, as lecturer on "historical ornament", he became a member of the teaching staff of the *National Art Training School*, an institution of good standing, where he continued until his death. In the meantime — especially in the '70s and '80s — he also delivered a large number of public lectures on historical as well as, in what was called the *Sunday Lecture Society*, on secularistic-atheistic topics. He came to be one of London's well-known and popular secularist pamphleteers of the day. During the course of his career he estimated that his lectures had been attended by some 180 thousand people. In partial testimony to this, his name crops up in various English private letters and memoirs, as someone who "taught history".⁵

The first significant landmark in Zerffi's teaching career was a course of lectures on "the Historical Development of Ornamental Art" which he gave to the students of the National Art Training School. It also appeared in book form in 1876 under the title *A Manual of the Historical Development of Art*. This work reflected, on the one hand, the impact of positivist and determinist thinkers such as Taine and Carrière as well as the teachings of Darwin and also of Gobineau (the views of the latter were spreading rapidly at the time). On the other hand, the *Manual* already exhibited many of the characteristic features of Zerffi's conception of history, besides and especially elucidating his ideas concerning the development of art or, more precisely, "ornamental art".

By the time of the publication of his book, Zerffi had already formulated his views concerning the aim, significance and manner of history-writing. Although before 1848 he had mainly worked as a literary critic, he must obviously have been aware of the interest in history which became more and more characteristic of the intellectual life of pre-March Hungary. Apparently he was also familiar with the contemporary literature on history. His activities as a historian in Britain were thus probably rooted in his experiences during the Hungarian Reform Period and the revolution of 1848, even if it was not until the 1870s that his attention shifted from applied art-history-writing to historiography proper.⁶ These might have been his motives for joining, as early as the spring of 1874, an organization without much tradition at the time, the *Royal Historical Society*.

Founded in November 1868 the Society was, in these years, struggling with the grave problems of dilettantism and lack of interest. Nor was it granted its "Royal" title until 1872, and it took long years for the few dozens of founding members to increase, by the end of 1874, its membership to 383 and, by the spring of 1880, to 670. The members at that time included hardly any professional historians. Among the clergymen, physicians, army officers, civil servants, lawyers, bank managers, journalists, engineers, teachers and, naturally, members of the House of Lords, the number of genealogists and antiquarians was insignificant. At the head of the Society was the Scottish Presbyterian minister and publicist Charles Rogers who had previously, and without success, applied for the Chair of Ecclesiastical History at the University of St Andrews. Rogers took upon himself the title "Historiographer" and his chief endeavour was to draw a considerable income from the rather modest funds at the Society's disposal.

Conspicuously enough, neither he nor other members of the governing body of the Society seem to have wished to establish connections with the intellectual circles striving to carry through a reform, just in the 1870s, in history teaching at Oxford and Cambridge. In 1866, just before the foundation of the Society, William Stubbs was appointed Regius Professor of Modern History at Oxford (at the same time A. W. Ward became a university professor in Manchester). At Oxford a School of Modern History was established in 1871. As for Cambridge, the historical *tripos* was created in 1873. Among the young dons at Cambridge we already find G. W. Prothero, W. Cunningham and F. W. Maitland; at Balliol College as undergraduates were the promising future scholars T. F. Tout, J. H. Round, Richard Lodge, R. L. Poole and C. H. Firth.⁷

With Gustavus George Zerffi, the amateurish Society, isolated from the fresh and professional trends of the day, received a member in many respects differing from the average. Zerffi was alien to antiquarianism, an enthusiastic passion of the majority, as well as to fact-finding and the pettiness and, for the most part, provinciality, of conceptions. He was a fierce and indefatigable antagonist of factography. From the very outset, he was renowned for his theoretical capacity and philosoph-

ical view of history. As early as the year he was admitted to the Society he read his first lecture "On the Possibility of a Strictly Scientific Treatment of Universal History", in actual fact a summary of his conceptions concerning historical theory. With his ample previous studies compared with the majority of the members, Zerffi, with his wider European outlook and greater intellectual flexibility was elected to the Council of the Society the following autumn. It was already as a member of the Council that he read his lecture on "Immanuel Kant in his Relation to Modern History" in 1876, and announced a course of four lectures on "The Historical Development of Idealism and Realism" (1877-1880).⁸

The Science of History

As a lecturer, a member of the leading body of the Royal Historical Society, and the author of a successful art history, Zerffi acquired considerable reputation. In circumstances hardly ever to be known, due to the alleged destruction of an important document in World War II, he got acquainted in 1878 or '79, with Suematsu Kencho (1855-1920), then secretary of the embassy of Japan in London. In addition to his being in the diplomatic service, this erudite and open-minded young Japanese had also received a special assignment before his departure from Tokyo.⁹

It was the first decade of the Meiji restoration that had put an end to the thousand years of feudalism in Japan. In its heated atmosphere, historiography acquired a particular political and ideological significance. Already in 1869, the young Meiji restoration saw to it that an "Office for the Collection and the Composition of the Sources of National History" (Shiryō Henshū Kokushi Kosei Kyoku) be set up. Before long, this became the "Office for the Composition of National History" (Kokushi Henshū Kyoku) which, in 1875, was transformed into the "Office for Historiography" (Shushi-kyoku). Eventually, it received its final name, "Historiographical Institute" (Shushi-kan), in 1877. The Institute was under the direct supervision of the Imperial Governing Office. Its leader, Shigeno Yasutsugu (1827-1910), maintained close contacts with the Meiji governing circles, e. g. with the influential Secretary of State Okubo Toshimichi. From the outset, he was also greatly interested in the methods of Western, especially British and French, historiography. It was the British and French historians that Shigeno considered to be the best seeds with which to fertilize Japanese history-writing - at that time stuck at descriptivity and chronological fact-finding. Shigeno was convinced that, besides political history, a viewpoint meagre in itself and yet almost exclusively accepted by contemporaneous Japanese history-writing, it was also necessary to carry out studies in economic and social history as well as in the history of ideas, the last of these at the same time revealing the causal relations of history. This programme of an up-to-date analysis with Western European standards of the national history of Japan not only met, as we have seen, the urgent political

needs of the Meiji administration, but also complied with Japan's overall endeavour to "open up" to Europe in economy, culture and ideology alike, from that time onwards.¹⁰

This is what lay in the background of Suematsu's assignment to study the achievements of British and French history-writing. In one of his lectures held in Tokyo at the time, Shigeno gave voice to his hopes for a new period to begin in Japanese historiography — and his words well reflected the expectations of the official Meiji circles concerning Suematsu's mission. Suematsu received his assignment on 9 February 1878. After more than a year, on 6 March 1879, he accordingly requested G. G. Zerffi to write a work on historiography. What made him choose Zerffi and whether he had spent the whole year in Britain is unknown. He presumably gathered ample information upon arrival in London, and doubtless received good references on Zerffi.¹¹ His attention may have been called to Zerffi's lectures on historical theory and the history of philosophy, which had been published by that time in the annual *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*. The interest of the young Japanese might already have been roused by the paper of 1874, which was Zerffi's point of departure and the theoretical foundation to all his later historical works. But Suematsu may also have found novelty in those essays where Zerffi, first emphasizing Kant's significance and marking his place in modern scholarship, described the struggle of idealism and materialism in Greek, Roman, mediaeval and, finally, in modern philosophers. Suematsu must have noticed Zerffi's concept requiring a philosophical attitude in scholarship, as well as his deistic "philosophy" of "reconciliation", attempting thereby to resolve the antagonism of materialism and idealism in Darwinian theory, and his view of history with its preference for far-flung summaries to the pettiness of factography. With Zerffi's omission of notes and references, it might not even have occurred to the Japanese, yet unfamiliar with European historiography, that the "British" historian's "foundation of historical theory" in 1874 was not in a single element original. Suematsu was probably also aware of a similar lack of originality in Zerffi's works on the history of philosophy. Apart from merely referring to Kuno Fischer's history of modern philosophy and F. A. Lange's work of growing popularity on the history of materialism, already in two editions at the time, Zerffi was also guilty of plagiarism since he took a number of facts and ideas from these two works.¹²

Unfortunately, the only evidence for their contact is an alleged letter from Suematsu to Zerffi with "Instructions" attached, published in Zerffi's *The Science of History*, which was written and also brought out in 1879. At any rate, Suematsu followed with great attention the progress of this work and, as he wrote to his father-in-law, future Prime Minister Ito Hirobumi, he spent considerable amounts of money on the royalty and printing expenses (naturally to be paid back later by the Historical Institute). Suematsu liked Zerffi's work and suggested its translation, which "would be of great service", to his father-in-law.¹³

Let us consider now the main outlines of this work, written at Suematsu's request, where Zerffi combined his experiences as a lecturer on history with his considerable erudition.

It is repeatedly pointed out that the work was "written . . . especially for Japanese scholars" with the intention "to leave nothing untouched that might serve to make them acquainted with the free and independent mode of thinking in the West". To support what he said Zerffi published Suematsu's "Introductory Letter" to him immediately after the Preface. Here his employer explained that in his country "at the present time the universal tendency is to adopt whatever is most excellent and worthy of imitation in European culture and experience". In compliance with his assignment from Tokyo, Suematsu pointed out that the chief objective of the work should be "to place before Japanese scholars, who desire to write the history of their own country, the most excellent European models . . ." Later he added: "You will also be particular to assign paramount importance to that part of the subject which relates especially to the advantages which result from the due combination of facts and philosophy . . . ; and to point out, how infinitely greater is the benefit, derived from the work in which events are thoughtfully traced to their causes, and connected with their consequences, than from the work in which the writer recounts a long series of facts, deducing no lessons from them . . ." ¹⁴

What is emphasized in the first place in the "Instructions" enclosed with the letter is the importance of historical studies. It is also expected of the author of the work to be written that an account be given of the virtues of the ideal historiographer and also of its most illustrious representatives. Suematsu wanted a presentation especially of the Greeks; as regards Roman and modern historiographers, he asked for a critical approach. In the following part he wanted Zerffi to classify and to describe chronologically the main achievements of European historiography and to give an analysis of the difficulties of obtaining source-material. He gave the author the instruction to point out the fact that those who aim at writing the history of a country are bound to account not only for the battles, governments, intrigues at court and debates in Parliament, but also to account for "the History of the people, the rise and progress of useful and ornamental arts, of religious sects, and of all those numerous changes which have taken place in the life and in the manners of successive generations, and, above all, their modes of thinking." Next, it would be an important task of the author to illustrate the philosophical conclusions that can be drawn from the events, to "show how Historians, like Voltaire in France, have, by their combined philosophy and eloquence, been sometimes authors of Revolutions in thought and feeling, which have, in their turn, paved the way for changes in dynasties and thrones." In the last "instruction" Guizot and Buckle appear, as personalities who were able to mould the materials of history, into form and "evolve from the philosophy of History, and analyze for us the growth of civilization." ¹⁵

Most of the objectives are in compliance with the conceptual content of Zerffi's work; on the whole, the twelve points of the "Instructions" give a summary of what the book is actually about and anticipate not only the character of the material to be used in the work but also its proportions and sometimes even its points of emphasis. It seems that the author himself had an intellectual influence over his instructor; his conceptions — already present in his lecture of 1874 and easily recognizable in his other works — are strongly reflected in the spirit of Suematsu's instructions. That Zerffi influenced rather than followed Suematsu's instructions is all the more probable as there is some difference between Suematsu's concepts and Shigeno's original instructions; this has been ascribed so far to the personal interest of the former in Japanese historiography.¹⁶

Whether set by Suematsu or himself, these objectives indicate the historico-philosophical disposition of this work of Zerffi, and mark off its place in history-writing. Apparent right at the beginning and fully in evidence throughout the work is what can be regarded as one of the basic elements in the ideological system of the Modern Age. Culminating in Hegel, this preoccupation with history entirely pervaded 19th century thinking.¹⁷ The "Instructions", however, contain references that are even more concrete; they reflect, beyond this general principle, the impact of historical positivism. Paradoxically enough, although a compilation (what more could Zerffi do in half a year?), it was exactly in this way that Zerffi's work could best fulfil its function: to provide a summary of the characteristics of Western European historical scholarship. Referring to as often as unscrupulously pirating their works, Zerffi not only described but also imitated the typical historians of the day. His work is an account of as well as an illustration to the view of history of Western European positivism and, in part, that of historicism. What constitutes its basic error is the fact that the author failed to get immersed, even to a minimal extent, in the immense contemporary literature on historical theory and methodology. Instead of profoundly studying them, he surveys the various historical trends with extreme superficiality, often vulgarly simplifying as well as confusing them. Often aware of, and presenting to his readers no more than the name of the prominent contemporary theoretician in question, or perhaps one or two spectacular elements of the relevant theory, Zerffi could hardly get down to the core of his ideology.

To offer as it were a foundation of historical theory, Zerffi almost entirely republished here his study written in 1874, where he had expounded some characteristic methodological principles of the positivist historians. Like for most contemporary positivists, for Zerffi, too, science was the saviour of mankind. As he professed, "we become masters of our destiny through science alone", also assigning to history not simply the status of science but the most privileged place among sciences. In fact, he calls history "the Science of Sciences". He points out repeatedly that "a scientific treatment of history is possible" and that "the science of

history" can, and must, discover the same connection as can be found "between the causes and effects of any other phenomena in the material world".¹⁸

What makes, in Zerffi's view, a Science of historiography? In the first place, it is the description of regularities in the development of mankind. „Wherever we can trace in phenomena, of whatever nature, the action of forces working according to certain laws, we may treat such phenomena scientifically", so the speculation starts. Chance, predestination, and free will have no place in the understanding of the real processes of history: "So soon as the historian has found his firm basis in law, he will be able to treat his subject systematically..." This idea of his study of 1874 is present in almost every chapter of *The Science of History*. Thus it becomes as it were the primary and basic methodological instruction for the Japanese historians. "History is in no way a mere accidental conglomeration of isolated phenomena." "The details increase, and might be increased *ad infinitum*; the law working in them must necessarily be the same. So soon as Historians undertake their work with a correct understanding of some generally pervading principle, the task of grouping and arranging their details will offer them no difficulties." It is in the spirit of the same idea that Zerffi sums up his work: "History is but the outer result of these inner forces, working in humanity, according to a pre-arranged law, which must be as fixed as that by which the solar systems are brought into order and cohesion. The task of Historians is to trace this law, whether in the History of single individuals, nations, or humanity at large."¹⁹

What is then the law that may become the explanatory principle of the history of all peoples and all ages? Stepping somewhat behind the contemporary universal theories of evolution, Zerffi considered only one principle as worthy of preference over the rest, viz. that of causality. In his own words, "same cause must produce the same effect." Consequently, the task of the historian is to search for the causes, and Zerffi shows the validity of the law in a series of concrete examples taken from history. Whether writing of Darius and analysing the progress of the Persian Wars, or examining the history of the formation of Christianity, whether explaining the causes and the results of the crusades or the impacts of great inventions, Zerffi lost no opportunity in emphasizing the inseparable correlation of cause and effect. Even when praising Bacon, what he underlines is the ability of the philosopher to impress us "with the more philosophical duty of comparing, drawing analogies, systematizing, and even predicting from given facts, or causes, future events, as their effects. These are pre-eminently speculative and reasoning functions of our mental faculty, which a Historian has to cultivate in the highest degree."²⁰

Zerffi's doctrine about history was presented here in a more detailed version than in his lecture in 1874. Zerffi's view that history was a science treating a coherent process interpretable in laws, especially in the law of causality, largely followed the dominant positivist attitude to the

history of the day. His rule-centred conception, which was closely related to a naturalistic epistemology with antique origins and complemented with evolutionary features right at the period in question, was especially attractive to Victorian thinking. By that time, German idealism had been struggling for a century with the problem of historical necessity. Positivist thinking did not thus serve for Zerffi, strongly influenced by Hegel and the German objective idealists, as the only source for his work.²¹ Among these general impacts, however, that of Henry Thomas Buckle, author of the *History of Civilization in England*, seems remarkable for being the most definite and unmistakable.

Already in Suematsu's "Instructions" can we find Buckle's name as well as his spirit. Zerffi's almost fanatic faith in the omnipotence of science comes, in the first place, from Buckle's *History*. "The discoveries of genius alone remain: it is to them we owe all that we now have...", Buckle professed, reasoning (over several pages of the introduction to his great work) for the possibility of the scientific investigation of history. Buckle claimed "that what we now call inexplicable will at some future time be explained," because "the marked tendency of advancing civilization is to strengthen our belief in the universality of order, of method, and of law." He regretted that the "expectation of discovering regularity" ... "is not generally found among historians", all the more so as he thought "the actions of men, and therefore of societies, governed by fixed laws." He considered it the basic condition for a scientific approach to history that the law should be recognized, according to which "when we perform an action we perform it in consequence of some motive or motives; that those motives are the results of some antecedents: and that, therefore, if we were acquainted with the whole of the antecedents, and with all the laws of their movements, we could with unerring certainty predict the whole of their immediate results." Raising convincing arguments against the doctrines of free will and predestination, he declared: "... the actions of men ... must, under precisely the same circumstances, always issue in precisely the same results". The introductory passages to the *History of Civilization in England* apparently seem to have provided the theoretical and methodological guiding principles for Zerffi's lecture in 1874 and his book in 1879.²²

Buckle's spirit is also apparent in Zerffi's fierce anticlericalism, manifested in his attacks against Augustinian philosophy, the clergy, and superstitious faith. Whereas Buckle (as well as Lecky and Draper) directed his criticism at the historical role of the church, it was for their contemporary influence that Zerffi condemned the clergy of his day. In his work, Buckle related the following: "... the literature of Europe, shortly before the final dissolution of the Roman Empire, fell entirely into the hands of the clergy... And as the clergy, taken as a body, have always looked on it as their business to enforce belief, rather than encourage inquiry,... literature, during many ages, instead of befitting society, injured it, by increasing credulity, and thus stopping the progress of knowledge. Indeed, the aptitude for falsehood became so great, that there

was nothing men were unwilling to believe. . . . history became monopolized by a class of men whose professional habits made them quick to believe, and who, moreover, had a direct interest in increasing the general credulity, since it was the basis upon which their own authority was built." Zerffi seems to have taken up the same thread when he remarked on the anti-clerical fights of mediaeval British historians that "it would be a great mistake to suppose that these powers have altogether lost their influence. Their oppressive tyranny is as cruel now, as it was in the times of the palmy days of the Inquisition. These are the same implacable, unrelenting priests, the same prejudiced zealots, the same credulous fanatics, who exclude honest opinions from the press, ignore unbiassed writings, calumniate authors behind their backs, hinder them in speech and writing, and shut them out from their universities, in order that the dogmatic sleep of bigots may not be disturbed." It was in Buckle's spirit that the slashes of Zerffi's critique were meant against the strong and unhindered mass influence of the clergy: "... a neglected and one-sided education has left the people as they were in the Middle Ages with regard to spiritual matters; and predestination, grace, eternal punishment, hell-fire, and the existence of the devil are still seriously discussed. The people still think that some self-conscious power . . . gives them food and raiment, or punishes them with wars, or bad weather." The parts in Zerffi's work underlining the significance of the reformation as well as those refuting Augustinianism with a rational and scientific ontology were all inspired by Buckle. Nevertheless, it is not so much the numerous instances of identity of textual details that place *The Science of History* alongside the *History of Civilization in England*; more importantly and significantly, both works are penetrated with the anti-clerical attitude opposing sciences to religion, and with the similar sarcasm of presentation.²³ It could not be incidental that it was, at least in part, for their similar attitude towards the church that both authors were attacked by contemporary critics — Buckle in Britain as well as in Hungary, and Zerffi in London, at the period of his presidency of the Royal Historical Society. Besides his consistent anti-feudalism, it was this theoretical framework that won many young people, always sensitive towards new ideas, in Britain as well as in Poland and Hungary, over to Buckle's conceptions, and gained significant reputation for Gustavus George Zerffi the secularist in London in the 1870s and the 1880s.²⁴

Obviously Zerffi, who made part of his living from secularistic and deistic pamphlets and lecture courses, was not exclusively Buckle's disciple in this respect. Secularism, especially after Darwin, came to be one of the dominant trends of contemporary philosophical theory. Zerffi was probably led as much by the positivist Buckle (and probably Draper) as by others, when discoursing on "Dogma and Science".²⁵ However, in his Darwinistic and evolutionary "ontology" the influence of Buckle seems to be supported by the evidence of further parallels.

"The doctrines declared to be orthodox by papal and imperial authority, and by ecclesiastical and criminal laws, have been overthrown

by a silently working power, manifested in our sciences and discoveries", Zerffi wrote. "We now know as an indisputable fact that thousands of different species, and even genera of living creatures, have passed away; that millions and millions of human beings must have lived and died long before Adam was created. . . . We know that the Sun does not move round the earth; that the sky is not a fixed dome, or, as Augustine tells us, stretched out like a skin; that the earth was not created out of nothing, unless nothing means something, as has been most learnedly asserted; . . . that the earth is not the central and most important body of the universe; that the earth could not have been created in six days; that it is not flat, serving as a footstool to the Deity; . . . that the whole chronology of the learned in the Scriptures is a mere idle fabrication of some Rabbis and Bishops, who knew nothing of History." Zerffi's way of arguing against the Augustinian world view was, as we can see, that of the vulgar Darwinist. At the beginning as well as at the end of his work, however, he declared that "the important agent in history is undoubtedly man", and, what is more, not man as an individual, but "mankind in general, . . . the one great and mighty agent of History". It is as the hero of history that man needed historical knowledge, Zerffi concluded. For what is the destination of man? The answer is civilization, which the author first attempted to describe after the definitions of Gobineau, Guizot, and Wilhelm von Humboldt, only to find its ultimate meaning (in part following, though not understanding, Buckle) in that "perfect balance between the two acting and reacting, the static and dynamic, or the moral and intellectual forces in humanity."²⁶

As can be seen from this work as well as from his lecture of 1874, the struggle between the "static" or "moral" and the "dynamic" or "intellectual" forces was a central concept in Zerffi's description and interpretation of historical movement. This developed, especially ten years later, into an all-comprehensive principle of the "theory of history" of his last considerable work, the *Studies on the Science of General History*. In his opinion, there were two forces operating in man: the active and dynamic force of his *intellect*, and the passive and static force of his *morals*. According to the author of *The Science of History*, "we may . . . reduce scientifically all the phenomena of history to a *plus* or *minus* in the relative quantities of the two acting and reacting forces in humanity, the static or moral and the dynamic or intellectual, constituting the principal elements of man's double nature." "The whole study of History from a higher general and scientific point of view resolves itself into a correct tracing of the disturbances in the two forces. All the phenomena in the flowing and ebbing ocean of the *past*, *present* and *future*; all religious, social, political, artistic and scientific events may be referred philosophically to a conflict of morals with intellect or of intellect with morals."²⁷

Several points of his reasoning come from Buckle; in the first place, his discourses on the historical role of man, on the concept of civilization, and on the *relationship between morals and intellect*. To this last point Buckle had devoted a whole chapter, and what Zerffi did was merely to

replace the greater historical role of the intellect with the theory of *balance between these two "forces"*. Here Zerffi appears consciously to deviate from Buckle, in order to answer a question also of importance to himself. In his 1874 article he had entered into an even more open "controversy" with the British historian without, however, mention of any name of "historians...[who]... make the fatal mistake of directing their attention to mere effects instead of endeavouring to discover the causes."²⁸

Conspicuously enough, Zerffi consistently transformed Buckle's theory of history at those places where the latter explained history as the continuous struggle between the classes. Zerffi stubbornly substituted for the idea of class struggle his own model of the conflict of intellect and morals. It would thus be wrong to regard him as a faithful disciple or epigone of Buckle, or, incidentally, of positivism in general: Zerffi failed to understand, or refused to accept, some of the basic principles of that radical trend of positivist theory of history of which Buckle was the main representative. Besides the principle of class struggle, *The Science of History* also lacks a real socio-historical disposition. Zerffi's anti-feudal disposition was, unlike Buckle's, restricted to clichés (and anti-clericalism). Zerffi failed to recognize that this would have been the most important positivist instruction to Japanese historians rehearsing to struggle against their own feudalism. In opposing Buckle, it was in two fields that Zerffi all too consciously followed radically different principles. Along two, partly distinct and partly interrelated lines of reasoning, Zerffi ended up in racial theory (categorically rejected by Buckle) on the one hand, and on the other, he came to be an enthusiast of antiquity treated casually by the British historian, particularly of ancient Greece. How was the Hungarian-born historiographer, compiling his instructive work for the Japanese, influenced in these areas?

Paradoxically enough, what brought him to racial thinking was precisely his views on the universal character of historical scholarship. For Zerffi real history was *General History*, i. e. a universal and all-comprehensive discipline characterized, in the first place, by its "exclusively philosophical standpoint" and by "grasping the totality of mankind with all its details". A "general" (i. e. universal) historian must be well-versed in modern source-criticism and know all the auxiliary sciences of history. In Zerffi's opinion such a *General History* had not yet received its proper place among the other scholarly disciplines, and was still not considered worth studying at British universities. He does, in fact, seem to have disregarded completely those changes which were going on at that very time in university education as well as the contemporary achievements of historical research.²⁹

However, as early as at this phase of his career, a contradiction can be detected, which later his whole oeuvre would be more and more imbued with, and which would reach its apex in the two volumes of his *Studies on the Science of General History*. Characteristically, Zerffi restricted the universal character of his theory of history delineated above: it was only *within*

the "same Indo-European, or European-Aryan, or Teuton family" that he considered "the broad understanding of historical phenomena" desirable and wanted to avoid "one-sidedness . . . purposely fostered" and "artificial animosities". In other words, he attempted to reconcile his "universal" point of view with racial theory.³⁰ This irrationalistic element did not remain an isolated epistemological maxim of his historical theory: his description of actual historical and, presented alongside it, historiographical progress is essentially based upon racial thought. It was the white race, more specifically the "Teutonic-Aryan" family, that Zerffi regarded as the real protagonists of historical action, and he considered the Greeks the earliest as well as the most advanced representatives of the same Aryan "Kulturkreis". A positivist and a determinist at the outset, Zerffi let himself be influenced by radically different trends of contemporary theory of history, his views thus becoming a reconstruction of these trends, original, if not in source, at least in its characteristic eclecticism.

Already the proportions of this extensive work reflect a kind of value judgement. In his survey of European historiography, Zerffi devoted two chapters to *Greece* (170 pages), almost as many pages to ancient *Rome*, 132 pages to *Mediaeval Christianity*, little more than a hundred to the period of the *Decline of Feudalism and the Renaissance*, and, in his last chapter, he gave an approximately 130-page long summary of the period from the reformation to his own times, i. e. the second half of the 19th century. We can thus see that, with the progress of time, less and less space was left for the presentation of the course of universal history and its historiographical reflection. His basic concept of "Greek History" serving us "as the key for the solution of all further historical phenomena", incidentally, often emphasized elsewhere, too, was implicitly contained in this fact. Zerffi found his historical ideal in the Greek world, and in this work, just as some years later in his *Manual of the Historical Development of Art*, he presented the Greeks as the ideal of, or the standard for, historical development.

How did he explain his devotion towards the Greeks? In the first place, he accounted for his enthusiasm by the fact that, in his opinion, it was this nation that realized, in the purest sense, a kind of ideal development which Zerffi, in his manuscript written for the Japanese, thought particularly important for them to follow. "Nothing strikes us more forcibly in the historical phenomena of the Greeks than the systematic and gradual process of their moral, intellectual, artistic, and philosophical development." Influenced by Buckle as well as by Taine's "milieu theory", Zerffi derived the harmony, the zeal and the success of the historical development of Greece from the serenity and balance of their geographical environment. He did not fail to draw simultaneously a parallel between the similarly favourable geographical situations of Greece, Britain, and Japan. For Zerffi, the Greeks were "the first genuine representatives of the progressive historical development of humanity at large", whom he celebrated at the same time as "the first historically self-conscious nation."

He felt sympathetic to them because "the Greeks . . . never submitted their individuality to a theocratical, or any other, state-abstraction." It was so important to know their history that, in Zerffi's opinion, the study of the Greeks should form the basis of higher education as well, since "whatever Rome, France, Germany, and England have accomplished in their progressive development in religion, sciences, arts, and morals, can be traced back to Greek influences."

As a logical consequence of this conception, Zerffi also presents and evaluates Greek historiography as the standard example to follow: "A historian can only reach excellence if he has made himself thoroughly acquainted with Greek historiography." He accounts for the high standard of Greek historians partly by the democratic laws and spirit of that country and partly — under the influence of Buckle — by the lack of an "intellectually exploiting" priest-caste. The Greek historian was the writer as much as the creator of his own history, and in a free country he could tell the truth without fearing prosecution.³¹

As for the image of Rome depicted in *The Science of History* it is, almost from passage to passage, diametrically opposed to that of Greece. While emphasizing that Rome was the other centre of, in his own words, the same "Aryan" *Kulturkreis*, Zerffi argued, with reasons well-known from his *Manual*, that the Roman state was the manifestation of an autotelic legal attitude and an *abstraction* ruthlessly suppressing the individual: "Brute force was the motor in the Roman State from the very beginning. The son was overawed by the father, the father by the community, the community by the province, the province by Rome, Rome by its rulers, and its rulers by the State." Here the individual was subordinated to an abstract and mystical idea aimed at its total annihilation. In such a country those who told the truth were silenced as a matter of course, hushing up and hypocrisy were welcomed instead. The Roman political climate was so unfavourable for impartial historiography that they had no real historians until Cicero. Not one branch of Roman literature was truly national; like their gods, they had been imported from different parts of the world.³²

In describing the course of human history, Zerffi passed through three stages of specific Aryan cult. According to a strange logic, however, he started from the admiration of Greece, and arrived, via the refusal of Rome, at the glorification of the "Teutonic" or "Germanic" nation. Already when discussing the Greeks, Zerffi had given voice to his opinion that there were basic differences between the black, yellow, and white races: "Only the White man, the Aryans, had a fluctuating and continually progressive history . . ." In Asia and Africa, history could not yet have begun: we can study but "the unhistorical spirit of humanity" here. The real centres of historical development had come about in the southern (Greece and Rome), north-western (France, Britain and Germany), and north-eastern (Russia and other Slavonic states) parts of Europe. With the off-hand superiority of the European colonizer, Zerffi presents his own continent as the historical model for all the other contin-

ents. This attitude is especially obvious when he discourses on his ideal, the Germanic nations.

With Zerffi, the term "Teutonic" covers all the European nations save for the Hungarians, Turks, Greeks and the Latino-Romans. In his view it was the "Teutons" who had introduced mobility, change, and action into history. They were the "makers" of history. "Three-fourth of the habitable globe are swayed by Teuton ideas, Teuton knowledge, Teuton industry, Teuton commercial enterprise, Teuton taste, Teuton institutions, and Teuton inventions." Zerffi remarked here that with the Teutons the "amount of brain is on an average the same, and is, undoubtedly, larger than that of any other group of Humanity." This is an idea that had also appeared in his study in 1874 and, in a more detailed version, in his art history of 1876.³³

The way Zerffi presented the main stages of the historical development of humanity is definitive of both the structure and the message of *The Science of History*; at the same time it is the clearest evidence of the historical and methodological eclecticism of the author. The influence of Hegel, detectable in many other places and in several forms, can be traced even more positively here since Zerffi had obviously followed his historico-philosophical divisions, and partly evaluations, too, in the description of the universal course of historical development.³⁴ When Zerffi was so enthusiastic about the Greeks, he also continued a specifically British tradition: the Victorians' cult of antiquity had by this time a hundred years' tradition in Britain.³⁵ But there is a third important source to Zerffi's argumentation. In the first half of the century, a productive cooperation had started between the classical scholars of Germany and the leading circles of British intellectual life, that was later to characterize the whole Victorian period. Already around 1830, B. G. Niebuhr was in the centre of interest of the young generation at Cambridge. It was with his critical classical studies that the long and continuous influx into British historical thought of the ideas of German historicism — as regards the theory of history and, mainly, methodology — took their beginning. Zerffi had been educated in Austria, and this naturally implied, from the outset, a pro-German disposition as well as German cultural influences (to the extent that German was a mother-tongue for the Hungarian). It is only too natural that he gladly assisted in the strengthening of the above mentioned process and took advantage of the general and somewhat exaggerated interest of the British in German scholarship.³⁶ From as early as the 1850s he seems to have felt it his duty to popularize German literature and science; it was in the name of "brotherhood between England and Germany" and "the universal dominion of the Anglo-Saxon race" that he presented, in London, Goethe's *Faust* (in 1859 and 1862) to the British audience.³⁷ Later, following in the footsteps of British scholars, he not only transferred the main achievements of German classical scholarship to his British (and Japanese) readers, but himself made good use of the researches, already wide-spread in Britain, of the German scholars in constitutional, social and religious history.

There are no bibliographical notes to his work. If, however, we compile from his diverse references a list of the authors and works that he admittedly utilized, one thing will turn out to be obvious: he studied and strove to transfer to his Japanese audience mostly those British scholars who belonged to the school of German historicism, or at least based their conceptions on works from that country. Apart from his references to Hegel, Zerffi referred to Herder and Schlegel, B. G. Niebuhr, Th. Mommsen, Fr. Chr. Schlosser ("the giant of German historiography"), Wilhelm v. Humboldt, Max Müller, J. L. v. Mosheim, P. v. Bohlen and F. A. Wolf. Even from among British works, what he selected as his sources and what he drew to the attention of his Japanese readers were books such as W. Smith's *Dictionary of Greek and Roman Mythology* (1849), a compilation of German-educated scholars and J. R. Green's *A Short History of the English People* (1874), also written under strong German influence. To support his views on the Aryan question, Zerffi also refers the reader to a number of German scholars, in the first place to W. v. Humboldt, Jakob Grimm, Franz Bopp, Max Müller, Ernst Curtius, Albert Kuhn and S. F. Pott. Apart from their originals, most of these works were accessible to contemporary British scholars in translation.³⁸

While starting his detailed account of the course of historical and historiographical development with the concepts and objectives of positivism, Zerffi also utilized and popularized, at the crucial points, the principles of historicism and German historical thought in general. His turn from positivism to "biological" and irrational German nationalism, and to the theory of German (or, to be more precise, Prussian) intellectual and physical superiority as well as to other reactionary German ideologies that were more and more dominant in the second half of the 19th century, is one of the most interesting features of his oeuvre.³⁹ There is a striking contradiction here between his initial standpoint and his eventual view. The reasons for this contradiction might have been the following: on the one hand, Zerffi wrote his work in the decade of the suppression of the Paris Commune and the establishment and stabilization of the German Empire; on the other hand, Zerffi was under the influence of the Prussian historical school which supported in every respect (and, in turn, was supported by) the new Prussian state.

As early as at the beginning of the 1860s, Zerffi had joined the London section of the *Deutscher Nationalverein*, a nationalistic organization of German emigrés. It was headed at the time partly by the poet and politician Gottfried Kinkel, and for a short time Zerffi managed to be secretary of the group. Presumably he acted on instructions from Vienna when he joined the association (he was perhaps to turn the originally "little German" ideas of the group under Prussian leadership, by no means harmless to Austrian interests, into pro-Austrian "pan-Germanic" slogans). But his correspondence with Kinkel makes him appear to be an unequivocal supporter of German unity. Consequently, the reformulation of the international political battle-field at the turn of the 1860s

and 1870s probably had a great effect on him and, incidentally, on the majority of the British public who warmly welcomed the unified German state. Although British public opinion was controversial in its assessment of the Franco-Prussian war, a significant number of scholars and journalists agreed with John Morley, editor of *The Fortnightly Review*, that nothing could be more desirable "in the interest of the highest civilization than the interposition in the heart of the European state-system, of a powerful, industrious, intelligent and progressive people between the Western nations and half-barbarous Russian swarms." There were even those who did not pretend to grieve for humiliated France, the arch-enemy, even though they sympathized neither with the means nor with the objectives of Prussian militarism. The recognition of this new Germany was also urged by economic as well as political considerations. Zerffi could hardly abstain from this heated polemic present in the British press, and most probably he became at once an adherent of the new Empire.⁴⁰

All this must have contributed to the fact that in his criticism of contemporary historiography Zerffi's stand of simplification showed a complete lack of refinement. Instead of giving an objective account of the individual historiographical achievements and the theoretical and methodological principles professed by the historians in question, he presented evaluations according to national, perhaps even political, considerations.

In the first place, his description of German historiography was extremely favourable. When he distinguished between contemporary German historiography and British and French history-writing he did not only do so covertly, i. e. in taking over some of their principles and methods and in concrete references to German scholars. He was extremely brief in his account on and evaluation of contemporary historical science (as was also pointed out by Professor Imai and later by other Japanese critics); but there can be no mistake about his open enthusiasm for German scholarship and about his frequent counterposing it to British and French historical literature. What makes it all the more eye-catching is the fact that it was just from the presentation of the latter that his employers expected the most: the scholars in Dr. Shigeno's institute wished to write the history of Japan after British and French patterns. In Zerffi's calculation, some 254 "important and independent historical works" had been written by German authors in his century. In his rather emphatic summary at the end of his work, Zerffi mentioned the names of J. A. W. Neander, F. Chr. Dahlmann, B. G. Niebuhr, E. Curtius, Th. Mommsen, L. v. Ranke, J. J. v. Görres, J. v. Hormayr, A. v. Pfister, W. Menzel and H. v. Sybel. He did not think that the great German historical literature was sufficiently spread in Britain (contradicting here K. Dockhorn, an excellent modern researcher of the problem). In his judgement, both the number and the quality of the translations were unsatisfactory, and most of them came about only as a result of the speculation of publishers. On the other hand, as he pointed out at another

place, "There is not a single Historical work of any importance, written in any European, or Asiatic language, that is not translated into German. . . . All the classical and Historical works of the Chinese and Japanese are translated, commented upon, and brought into systematic order." Imai Toshiki rightly pointed out in as early as 1939 that Zerffi had drawn the attention of the British reading public to the significance of the German historical school years before Lord Acton's famous programme essay, the *German Schools of History*, appeared in the first number of the then newly founded *English Historical Review*.⁴¹

Zerffi had a journalist's instinct for sensation in detecting and reacting on the new trends, with surprising rapidity. It was with great attentiveness that he followed the "modernities" of the 1870s, and among them, the re-discovery and the popularization of Gobineau. This is all the more remarkable, as otherwise Zerffi roughly attacked the contemporary French historians in the portraits he drew about them in his work. Although he recommended French literature on China and Japan to his employer, on the whole he fundamentally rejected "their Parisian mode of thinking and arguing", making "their Histories and Historians national curiosities and peculiarities". In his view, "the French will neither study nor write History from an objective, purely scientific, point of view" and so "we shall seek in vain for the true Historians among them."⁴²

This unfavourable image that he drew of French historiography is another proof to the political motivations in Zerffi's conceptions on historiography. He had taken an anti-French stand at the end of the 1850s, as shown convincingly and in great detail by a political pamphlet that appeared anonymously in 1860, but it unambiguously proved to have been written by Zerffi. He published his *Civilization in Hungary* if not on the instructions at least under the influence of Vienna, as an answer to a pamphlet by Bertalan Szemere, the exiled Hungarian premier of 1849 (which appeared in French and later in English). This one-volume work has two chapters (more than 60 pages) revealing the political ambitions of France and discrediting Bonapartist designs with historical, ideological as well as cultural-anthropological data and arguments.⁴³ Just as the pro-German features of Zerffi's historical views are directly connected with his political attitude, largely formulated in Vienna and having taken its shape decades before, so did his anti-French historiographical conceptions obviously come from the political period of his emigration. Zerffi's unconcealed political disposition, pervading his whole oeuvre as a historian, is a direct consequence of his earlier occupation as an Austrian agent. What Zerffi the agent had to say in politics was as it were translated by Zerffi the historian to the language of history.

Gobineau was an exception for Zerffi, probably because he considered him up-to-date. It was for this reason that he incorporated in his theory of history, otherwise greatly influenced by Hegel and German historicism, rather aggressive racial considerations. Notably, he mentioned Gobineau in the first place (as early as on the fifth page) among the hundreds of historians and philosophers referred to in his book, although the philosoph-

ical attitude of the French theoretician entirely differed from the majority of Zerffi's other sources. One of the most significant critics of Buckle, Lord (at the time Sir John) Acton, felt that what was missing in Buckle's *History of Civilization in England* was just the proper consideration of Gobineau; neither was the German school of historicism characterized by such overtly racial thinking.⁴⁴ As A. Momigliano pointed out in his pioneering article on Zerffi, this kind of thinking is especially astonishing in a work written for an Asiatic nation: Zerffi was not distracted by the fact that with the conceit of the "civilizer" he was putting the same nation as the one by whom and whose "enlightenment" he was appointed to write his work at a lower stage of development in his theory.

Although going to extremes in the arguments (e. g. Zerffi stated "that the love of independence and progress, and the vitality of the intellectual and moral forces, may be measured, according to the greater or less Teutonic blood still flowing through the veins of the southern nations"). *The Science of History* has remarkably less to offer right at this point than his theoretical finding written in 1874. What Momigliano failed to notice is the fact that there is no detailed explanation of a theory here, accounting for the differences between the human races in their historical capacity with "proofs" taken from craniometry. Zerffi had arrived at such a theory much earlier, as can be seen from his article in 1874. Whether Suematsu had objected to the craniometrical arguments of that study, or Zerffi himself had felt that his anatomical "evidences", so condemning the "yellow race" as well, had no place in a work intended for the Japanese, we do not know. But one thing is certain: there is no chart in *The Science of History* (as there was in the study written in 1874) showing the correspondence between the cerebral volumes of the various ethnic groups and their "moral" and "intellectual" powers. Zerffi saw to it that, unlike he had done on the pages of the *Transactions* years before, he did not describe in his new book the Japanese as an ethnic group of static character, with brains smaller by 9 cubic inches than the "white-Aryans", and thus suitable only for trading, agriculture and shepherding. He would present his whole theory again only in the first volume, intended for the British audience, of his *Studies* in 1887; this would be the final and most detailed version of his craniometric racial theory.⁴⁵

What was, in Zerffi's views, the essence of human progress? What were the laws of man's course in history and how could it be characterized? In the first place, "Man's progressive development" unfolded itself through the mastering and the subordination of "his lower animal nature". Human history is progress, more specifically a "slow and gradual development", which can be observed "in the material as well as in the intellectual world". Its "slow and gradual" character will return time and again in Zerffi's "philosophy of history", where degeneration appears as a possible alternative, though categorically denied by the author, to evolution. In Zerffi's opinion, the other possibility, "sudden, spasmodic changes" (i.e. revolutions) are "unusual phenomena, that take place under some foreign influences, and often cease as suddenly, as they began."

As contrasted to this, "the normal evolution moves in a wave-line with progressive and retrogressive curves. What Historians often call 'Modern History', relates simply to the formation of new circles of culture on old principles . . ." Incidentally, the idea of revolution seems almost entirely missing from his works which is, to say the least, rather unusual for a personal participant of 1848 and '49 and, later, for an active and rather "long-term" counter-revolutionary character. He considered Edmund Burke's work on the French revolution "genial though one-sided"; and simply disregarded it; at another place he referred to socialism merely pointing out "its pernicious and dreamy cravings".⁴⁶

Zerffi's "theory of evolution" and the "model of progress" that he offered to the Japanese (if these are appropriate terms at all for his oversimplified and unelaborated system) bear the marks of an idealistically conservative eclecticism which characterized his historical views. It was here that the influence of Hegel and Darwin reached him most. Although Zerffi openly admitted the influence of the German philosopher at some places, Hegel's spiritual presence can be felt all through Zerffi's discussion of man's development. "We may characterise nature as the development of matter in space; whilst History is the development of spirit in time" — an aphorism condensing Zerffi's conclusions from his studies of Darwin and Hegel. However, this curious outcome of mixing the two theories was not directly effected by Zerffi's Hegelian studies. The view of the British ecclesiastical historian L. E. Elliott-Binns that Hegelianism was entirely alien to British philosophical thought has not been generally accepted. That it was so wide-spread can hardly be explained away with the paradox that "Oxford is the place to which good German philosophies go when they are dead."⁴⁷ The majority of British and German historians are rather of the opinion that Victorian thinking was generally saturated with the belief in progress, and it was getting more and more optimistic with the rise of the living standards of the bourgeoisie. Hegelian philosophy was in perfect harmony with this intellectual climate. It became astonishingly widespread in Britain particularly in the second half of the 19th century. To see this, we have only to glance at the philosophical works of Sir William Hamilton, James Hutchinson Stirling (*The Secret of Hegel*, 1865), Robert Adamson, Thomas Hill Green, John and Edward Caird, F. H. Bradley, B. Bosanquet, William Wallace, James Ward, James Seth and J. McT. E. MacTaggart. In their oeuvres philosophical idealism proved to be victorious for the second time. Hegelian thought was especially triumphal in three fields: political science, theology, and the "humanities". In the second half of the century, Oxford and Glasgow counted as the dominating centres of British Hegelianism, and later on a number of historiographers were also attracted to this philosophy. Among them were Sir James Frazer, R. L. Poole, Sir Richard Lodge, James Tait, Frederick Powicke, A. L. Smith, T. F. Tout, to mention just a few. Curiously enough, as witnessed by his German translator Arnold Ruge, Buckle himself admitted that he had "learnt much from Hegel".⁴⁸

Finally, it is interesting to note that Hegel had affected even those German historians (in their majority well-known to and utilized by Zerffi) who, like Ranke, Dahlmann, Gervinus, Droysen, Gierke and Meinecke, would rather deny his influence on their intellectual development and historical concepts. Although this penetration of Hegelianism into German historicism, so much admired as well as popularized by Zerffi, is remarkable, it has not yet been given adequate treatment by researchers in historiography and the history of ideas.⁴⁹

Besides Hegel, Zerffi was also influenced by the positivist thinkers Comte, Buckle and Spencer; it was mainly the optimism in their highly esteemed evolutionary theories that left definite marks on Zerffi's philosophical thinking. At the same time, his somewhat obscure conceptions also radically differ from the rather mature and clear-cut evolutionary theories of the positivists. The latter, on the one hand, attempted to find the answers to Hegel's questions themselves, and on the other they were directly inspired by the immense experiences of the great revolutions and the equally great scientific discoveries of their century. It is perhaps in this respect that a parallel can be drawn between them and Zerffi, since Darwin's works had vastly influenced his concept of the world as well. In his *The Science of History*, as in all his other works, the effect of the great British scientist is unmistakable.⁵⁰

This apparent coexistence of Hegelianism and positivism in Zerffi's oeuvre is a characteristic Victorian phenomenon. In offering a solution to the obvious differences between the development of German and other Western philosophies of the age of imperialism, Georg Lukács also referred to this problem: "The revolution of 1848 marked the end of Hegelianism in Germany; it was the irrationalist Schopenhauer who became the leading philosopher of post-revolutionary Germany. Hegelian philosophy, however, preserved its leading role in the Anglo-Saxon countries and in Italy, and its influence was even on the increase. This was because the bourgeois idea of progress was not caught up in an open crisis there, as it was in Germany: the crisis remained latent and hidden but, as a consequence of the failure of 1848, the notion of progress was on the wane. From a philosophical point of view this led to Hegelian dialectic totally losing its aspect of 'revolutionary algebra' (Herzen) and to its gradual identification with Kant and Kantianism. That is why this sort of Hegelianism was, especially in the Anglo-Saxon countries, a parallel phenomenon with advancing sociology which, especially in the case of Herbert Spencer, preached Liberal evolutionism." His remark on Kant is especially interesting since Zerffi's Hegelianism was also directly connected with Kantian thought. He had proposed already in his lecture on Kant in 1876 that "Hegel built on Kant". His remarks on the relationship between Kant and Hegel are illustrative of the career of Hegelian thought in Victorian thinking.⁵¹

What methodology, taken in its narrower sense, did Zerffi intend to hand over to his Japanese readers in *The Science of History*? What kind of direct assistance did he offer to the would-be authors of the national history of Japan?

There is ample methodological advice on historiography scattered throughout the nearly eight hundred pages of the work, usually adjoined to the (ancient or mediaeval and only very rarely modern) author just discussed. Here, too, the joint inspiration of positivism and historicism is apparent. Zerffi thought it was "the principal duty of Historiographers, to arouse the reasoning faculty, to stimulate intellect to a higher culture, and to enable mind to acquire a deeper understanding of man's glorious destiny." He intended to make it quite clear to his Japanese readers that the historiographer was inseparable from his age and that changes in historical concepts could always be traced back to changes in society. In flat contradiction with his own theory of universal evolution, he put forward the dilettante's idea about the historian's task first to delineate national history in its main trends and only then to insert in his sketch "all the details . . . as mere secondary and accidental occurrences." Zerffi also called to the attention of the Japanese the need to study the works of scientists, geographers, archaeologists, moralists, orators, poets and satirists, in order to "enable us to form a correct notion of the intellectual activity, and the innermost mode of thinking of a nation . . ." Sources must be utilized as much as later literature on them, and the most adequate method for this was comparison, which Zerffi recommended to his readers over and over again. He was a zealous adherent of comparative literary criticism and comparative history of religion, as well as of comparative philology. Besides synchronic comparison, he suggested that parallels should also be drawn between the historical phenomena of different ages and regions, so that, despite their superficial difference, common features could be discovered to prove their essential identity.

Among Zerffi's numerous methodological remarks those on *impartiality* are the most frequent. There could hardly be a better example for the discrepancy, not unusual with him in other respects, either, between the theory he professed and the practice he followed. His views, not in the least impartial, time and again contradict his often declared claim for impartiality. Here as well, the illustrious positivist demand of objectivity remained but a slogan for Zerffi; he was unable to pursue it with any degree of consistency in his own works. He condemned partiality, prejudice and the biased attitude as the greatest possible faults of a historiographer — which may well be rather astonishing for his readers, since it is precisely these errors that he makes almost in every one of his chapters and with each author discussed in his works. Did he consider his Japanese readers unable to recognize the striking contradiction between their instructor's principal attitude ("the Scientific Historian must train himself to such a degree of independence of opinion that he may be strictly just to friend and foe") and, for example, his value judgements concerning contemporary British, French and German historiographers? He must have been either cynical or else plainly obtuse to have remarked at the end of his book that he "endeavoured to lay before [the] readers an impartial and unprejudiced History of Histories."⁵²

Habent sua fata libelli.

At Suematsu's expense, Zerffi had his work published "privately printed as manuscript" in 300 copies in London, one hundred of which were sent further to Tokyo by his employer. Since Shigeno himself did not read English well, the book had to be translated for him. Nakamura Masanao, a man of good reputation and great authority was appointed to carry out this task. After translating the first chapter, however, he was prevented from further work by other engagements, although there were definite plans to publish Zerffi's book in Japanese. The project was taken up again only after the arrival of Suematsu himself who, in the meantime, had been on a long tour in Europe. Thanks to his father-in-law, Suematsu had a quick and a magnificent career: he rapidly got into the government (first as Minister of Trade and Agriculture, then as Minister of Transport, after this as Minister of the Interior), and later into the Privy Council; at the same time, he preserved his astonishingly wide scope of interest. He translated literary works from Japanese into English and from other Western languages into Japanese (e. g. Balzac's *Le lys dans la vallée*), besides writing works on literary criticism as well as composing poems. With his later pioneering studies in Roman and Western European law, he came to be one of the first scholars to introduce this area of Western social thought in Japan. He also produced a number of historical works, mostly on questions of "contemporary" interest (e. g. on the Russo-Japanese war). This educated and extremely influential man saw to it that after so many years, his friend Saga Shosaku, editor of an economic journal, be appointed with the translation. Saga managed to cope with the huge material and by 1887 he was ready with the Japanese version of *The Science of History*.

It was never published, however. In the same year, the Historiographical Institute was adjoined to the Imperial University of Tokyo. A disciple of Ranke, Ludwig Riess arrived there as visiting professor; and with his leadership, the reorganization of Japanese historical science on a European, or more precisely, German, pattern, had really taken a start. Although, in the invitation of the German professor, Zerffi's pro-German instructions seem to have been followed, Riess was obviously little interested in the English work of a Hungarian emigrant in London, unknown to him. Be that as it may, it is primarily the translator who seems to have been responsible for the failure to publish Zerffi's book though this has not yet been admitted so openly by Japanese historiography.⁵³

In order to write, simultaneously with the translation, a work on history himself, Saga even gave up his job as an editor. In the same year of finishing the translation, he brought out his successful "Principles of Japanese Historiography." As Ozawa Eichi has recently pointed out in his historiographical study, this work contains a number of thoughts and even terms taken over from Zerffi. In Saga, too, we find the idea that history is a science of laws, and he also emphasizes its causal relations

and demands impartiality. A large portion of his work is taken up by a discourse on "civilization", and wherever he discusses the tasks and the appropriate methods of the historian and historiography in general, Zerffi's influence is unmistakable. However, Saga never referred to him, and he was probably personally interested that the manuscript should be kept from publication (up to the present times, it has been held in the archives). It is very unlikely, however, that he was aware of the true origin of Zerffi's ideas, viz. Hegel, Buckle, Gobineau, and Western European positivism as well as German historicism in general. Thus Zerffi came to be the anonymous motivator of a book rather wide-spread in Japan and used as a textbook at several schools at the time. In the course of this repeated plagiarism it was through Saga, and not Zerffi, that the leading figures of Western European thought received publicity in Japan.⁵⁴ *The Science of History* seems thus to have done little more than pave the way for the invitation of Professor Riess, serving as an inspiration for Saga and directly affecting only those few Japanese scholars who spoke English (copies of the book are still to be found in libraries in Japan). Even so, as is also confirmed by recent Japanese historiography, it contributed to the formation of the historical conceptions in Japan at the time of the Meiji, and to the diffusion of Hegelianism, positivism and historicism in the Far East. At any rate, *The Science of History* was a unique product and simultaneously a source-material for the eclectic "Europeanism" present in the historical thinking of Meiji Japan.⁵⁵

Chairing the Royal Historical Society

The rare appointment from the Japanese and the rapidity of publication as well as the size of his work must all have contributed to Zerffi's increasing authority in the Society. Hardly a month passed since he had finished his book when, in November 1879, he held an "inaugural" lecture bearing the title of his latest work, where he briefly summed up the main ideas of *The Science of History*, laying special stress on the significance of German historiography. At the session he also presented a long list enumerating the most outstanding representatives of historicism, and he made mention of Japan's renewed interest in history. He also mentioned that his lectures on history during the past six years had been attended by 45,576 people.⁵⁶ However, he remained indefatigable in undertaking courses; within half a year, the Council of the Society "passed a resolution appointing Dr. Zerffi to deliver without any charge to the Society, a course of 30 Lectures, 'On the Science of General History'." This series of lectures was held in the Lecture Theatre, South Kensington Museum (today, the Victoria and Albert Museum) and was attended by 5380 people, according to Zerffi's estimate.⁵⁷

At the end of 1880 Zerffi rose to the zenith of his career: he was elected Chairman of the Council of the Royal Historical Society.

This office had been created in 1876 by the then leaders of the Society, and was in existence until 1894. It was needed as long as the Presidency of the Society was a ceremonial office, occupied by unprofessional peers,

as for example former Prime Minister Lord John Russell or, between 1878 and 1891, former Home Secretary Lord Aberdare. Zerffi remained in his post for five years, and he retained his membership of the Council until his death. His election was closely connected with the fact that from 1878 onwards the Society had continually been attacked in the press for its low standards, its scant and feeble publications and for the indiscriminacy in the admittance of the members. These attacks were more and more directed against the "Historiographer", Charles Rogers. It was noticed that by the end of the 1870s the salary of the "Historiographer" was no less than half of the Society's annual income; no wonder that the financial position of the Society was condemned as particularly outrageous. The leadership was fiercely attacked in a whole series of articles in *The Athenaeum* between 1878 and '79. Rogers tried to silence his opposition whose attacks even reached the sessions of the Council and the general assembly of the Society. Scandal followed scandal in 1880 and 1881 until, after long debates, Lord Aberdare put an end to the whole affair. Rogers was forced to resign his office and, apart from some frustrated attempts in the press to regain his lost positions, he withdrew from the Society.⁵⁸

All along, Zerffi fought actively against Rogers, so it was hardly surprising that the latter also attacked Zerffi, at once his antagonist and his successor. Rogers' articles, whether of his own or written on inspiration, were especially directed against the "infidelity" and the "atheism" of Zerffi's lectures, built upon his book *The Science of History*, at South Kensington Museum. An anonymous article appeared, for example, in a November 1881 issue of *The Greenock Telegraph*, stating that "Dr. Zerffi's lectures at South Kensington on the Science of History are not to be resumed. The Doctor alleges that his last session lost £ 50 by the concern; but whether on this account, or of the Doctor's advanced theological opinions not being acceptable to the authorities, the lecturer will not again appear under the sanction of the Privy Council, or of the Royal Historical Society, as an expounder of history." This was probably an attempt to discredit an earlier report in the same paper, according to which the President of the Society, "our old County Member, now Lord Aberdare, has stated that he is opposed to Romanism; and he would appear to be more inclined to support Dr. Zerffi's historical opinions." This latter report was also published by the distinguished *The Press and St. James's Chronicle*, thus giving wide publicity to the official confidence in the new leader of the Society.⁵⁹

It was not without good reason that Zerffi counted on Lord Aberdare's support, since he rigorously kept to his requests and instructions as regards the management of the Society. Zerffi tried to keep out all petty personal affairs and selfish quarrels; as he wrote in a confidential private letter to his friend William Herbage, Treasurer of the Society, "For 25 years I teach History in this Country & know what the objections to the unbiassed Study of History are — to remove these objections & to show that there can be no real culture without History & to promote an independent mode of Historical inquiry & earnest research ought to

be our task and nothing is done in that direction; but quarrels are kept up on technicalities & boyish susceptibilities are indulged in which make one sick & tired. Please do not mind the petty minds — *Let us work on* as we have done & by degrees there is no doubt we shall bring some new Element into the Society, publish some good papers, edit some bibliographical notices and step by step interest the public. My own Experiences is that the want of knowledge of History increases day by day.”⁶⁰

Rogers’ resignation and Zerffi’s inauguration had actually brought a change into the life of the Society. The dangerous decrease of membership, a natural result of the unpleasant atmosphere, was successfully put to an end. Supported by Lord Aberdare, Zerffi and Herbage quickly settled the financial affairs of the Society and, following in the footsteps of other scientific societies, elaborated new regulations for the Society’s government. An editorial committee was set up to supervise the standards of the *Transactions*, which were indeed gradually improving (although real advance came only with the 1890s). And even if the professional conditions for admittance into the Society were still uncertain, and there was only slow increase in the Society’s competence, the turbulent times of Rogers were over. The success of Zerffi’s leadership resulted in the membership, between 1884 and 1886, of such scholars as Lord Acton, F. W. Maitland, M. Creighton, W. E. H. Lecky, J. R. Seeley and W. Cunningham. The Council rightly “congratulated the Society in 1887 on ‘the sympathy and support’ it had gradually enlisted ‘of those who are engaged in the cultivation of historical research in London, Oxford and Cambridge’.” Presided over by Seeley, the Cambridge branch of the Society was formed in 1885. In 1886, with the cooperation of the Public Record Office and the British Museum, the Society organized the Domesday Commemoration. In 1887, the first-ever Conference on “Historical teaching in Schools” was called together. Although these events partly pertain to the period after Zerffi’s resignation, his work doubtless contributed to the renewed development, after its crisis, of the Society.⁶¹

As a Chairman Zerffi aimed higher than simply managing the affairs of the Society. After his inaugural address he completed his series on the history of philosophy, and also read a paper on Voltaire in July 1881. In fact, the lecture was about Kant, as it was actually made up of his reflections on his own earlier lecture on the German philosopher. His purpose was to refute the academic circles in Vienna who argued that Kant was a blind follower of Voltaire. Zerffi tried to point out various differences between the oeuvres of the “scientifically trained Teuton” and the “witty Frenchman, who hated nothing so much as true profundity”. Consequently, this lecture became a panegyric of Kant: Zerffi claimed not only that the “constructive” German philosopher, who saw law in God and used reasonable arguments, was not a disciple of, but in almost every respect superior to, “un-historical” Voltaire, an excellent writer but “dogmatic” and “destructive” as a philosopher. In his zeal for Kant, Zerffi largely overshot his original purpose: putting forward his ideas in the Kantian way of reasoning, so characteristic of fin-de-

siècle British philosophy, he was repeatedly caught by the false and vulgar ideological trap of alleged qualitative differences between the Germans and the French.⁶²

His last lectures at the Society also tell of his wide scope of interest and his versatility. He delivered two lectures in 1882; one on "The Crown", a work of the Arabic geographer and historian from the 10th century Al-Hamdāni, and another lecture on Hungary in King Matthias' times. This is Zerffi's only work on Hungary. Psychologically, it may be justified perhaps that only in December 1882, at the peak of his scholarly career, after his social position was secured could he write on the history of his forsaken native country, for the first and for the last time. He did not and could not aim at originality in this work either. As he wrote, "having consulted and studied the best possible authorities on Hungary, the originality of my paper will consist in the arrangement of facts, and in the general conclusions drawn from them." In depicting the reign of King Matthias and, briefly, the Hungarian nation, he used whatever descriptions he could find in the works of Werbőczy, Thuróczy, Katona, Szilágyi, Fessler, Pray and others. Refusing to accept the theory of a direct Finno-Hungarian genetic relationship, he professed a common Turanian origin. He also drew a parallel between the political development of Britain and Hungary (this had been for decades a popular motive of historical journalism in both countries at the time).⁶³

He chose something remote both in time and space for the topic of his last lecture. He gave a historical analysis of the *Chung Yung* ("The Immobility of the Centre"), the "canon" of Confucianism. He connected this summary of Confucian morals, compiled by the followers of the Chinese philosopher, with his basic doctrine about the static character of the Chinese and the unequal development of morals and intellect in the Far East. As in almost all his lectures, he again referred to his "historico-philosophical" system elaborated in 1874.⁶⁴

One more writing in the annals of the Society may be ascribed to him, if only with reserve: an unsigned bibliographical note. In the 1884 volume of the *Transactions*, already containing two papers by the influential Chairman of the Council of the Society, a commentary was published on a volume of J. A. v. Helfert's modern history of Austria (*Geschichte Oesterreichs vom Ausgange des Wiener October-Aufstandes 1848*, [IV/1], Prag: Tempsky, 1876). In this short note, the author takes a uniquely Hungarian stand in analysing the work, displaying several characteristics of Zerffi's works, both in content and in style. "Impartiality is the first duty of a writer on past events. . . . If a writer cannot divest himself of petty or tribal feelings let him not attempt to write history." He strongly criticizes Helfert for his endeavour to justify Vienna in his book, and finds that the reason for the revolution had rather been the continual violation of the rights and privileges of the Hungarians: "Kossuth, Széchényi (sic), Szemere, Perczel, Batthyányi (sic), &c., were as innocent of the Revolution of 1848 as the double-tongued, deceitful, incapable Austrian rulers were guilty of it. . . . It was the King of Hungary who, after having

sworn allegiance to the Magyar Constitution, declared war as Emperor of Austria against the people who dared to stand by that very Constitution. History teems with anomalies, none greater than those committed in Hungary on the part of the Austrian Government. That the leader of the Magyars, M. Kossuth, was utterly incapable of steering the State ship through the storms of rebellion is too well known; but that in abasing Kossuth anyone should dare to praise Görgey is certainly not historical fairness. The Cromwells are rare, the O'Connells may abound, and Kossuth, who attempted to be a Cromwell, scarcely reached the oratorical genius of an O'Connell. To accuse him of petty ambition is unjust; to call him the 'cursed rebellion of 1848' is an outrage on truth. The Magyar nation in its overwhelming majority was with him; to make him a blind tool of 'Theresa Meszlényi' (his wife) is contemptible and mean; to extol the treachery of Görgey is an offence against every moral principle. . . . Perhaps we are not wrong to suppose that Zerffi, who might have had an inner conflict, clearly detectable from his other writings, with his own past as an agent of Austria, was turning against the official Viennese propaganda here.⁶⁵

Studies on the Science of General History

In the spring of 1885 Zerffi resigned his post at the Society and devoted his last years wholly to lectures on "general history" and art-history. He taught with the same vigour at the National Art Training School, and he gave, instead of the Sunday Lecture Society, several lectures on history at a popular "free school" named Crystal Palace Company's School of Art, Science, and Literature, term after term and, as he pointed out, mostly "for ladies". Earlier, at the end of his career at the Society, with three other colleagues he had organized here a session of characteristically Victorian disposition with the title "Evolution in History, Language, and Science", where he delivered an introductory lecture. Repeating, in part, his pet ideas about "general history", here Zerffi added a definite kind of social interpretation to the Spencerian-Darwinian "survival of the fittest" thus attempting to back up his racial pride, earlier related to Gobineau, with social Darwinism.⁶⁶

In the spirit of an allegedly common "Aryan-Teutonic" origin, Zerffi seems to have managed to overcome the paradox of maintaining the ideas of German cultural superiority and British imperialism at the same time. Two years later, in a lecture delivered also at Crystal Palace on the Irish Question, he appears to have openly supported the latter ideology. Characteristically, in order that he could prove the right of the British to conquer Ireland, here he attempted to refute the fashionable parallel between the development of Ireland and Hungary. He argued that while Hungary rightfully demanded independence within the Austrian Empire, Ireland was in no way entitled to the same within the British Empire.⁶⁷

However, this was not Zerffi's only lecture where the Victorian imperialistic ideal was in the ideological background. A part of his course

of lectures on history at the Crystal Palace Company appeared in booklets as well, and their success encouraged Zerffi to rearrange his material into volumes. He published the first volume of his *Studies on the Science of General History*, on ancient history, in 1887; the second volume (on mediaeval history) appeared in 1889. He had planned a third volume, too, but he died before it could be published, although the material had probably been completed by the end of the 1880s. Even though unfinished, this universal history of more than 900 pages was Zerffi's last and largest summary of his oeuvre, practically comprising all his previous works. In the two volumes, twenty studies each (the last volume on modern history was also to have contained twenty studies), there is hardly anything new. They contain Zerffi's familiar theoretical and methodological principles, and even whole chapters from his *The Science of History*. With their rich universal historical content, however, and with the author's excellent style and great narrative power, Dr. Zerffi's *Studies* must have appealed to his contemporary audience. The reader at the time could find it useful to have, after each chapter, a summary of the relevant literature as well as Zerffi's references to the best European authors of the day (even if the writer himself utilized, from among the multitude of works recommended for further reading, only those confirming his own conceptions).⁶⁸

At one basic point, however, Zerffi did go further in his historical theory in the *Studies*, and this was his racial ideology. Here Zerffi finally made up a coherent system of it. Opposing the south-eastern part of the earth to the north-western, he tried to prove the all-pervading superiority of the latter, the hemisphere of the Aryans. If mankind has achieved anything in science and law, it was thanks to this "race". To support his pro-Aryan theory, he makes use again of his old chart, compiled in 1874, comparing the brain volumes of the white, yellow and black peoples, and relating to this comparison the alleged differences in their abilities. Moreover, he extended his craniometrical arguments to the alleged differences, which Zerffi considered significant, between the brain volumes of men and women, and tried to explain with these "facts" what he considered a divergence in the intellectual abilities of the sexes.⁶⁹

To make his craniometrical explanation of the differences between the races and the sexes sound more authentic, in 1887 Zerffi gave a list of those researchers upon whose works he claimed to have based his own theory. However, the works of the anatomists left unmentioned in 1874, should have made him more cautious. However fashionable and wide-spread craniometrical ethnology was in Europe, it did not have the slightest anatomical foundation. Friedrich Tiedemann and Emil Huschke, whom Zerffi may have consulted superficially (or might simply have known their names), as well as the standard French anthropologist Paul Broca, who, although his collected papers had appeared in 1874 in Paris, was unknown to him, unanimously warned against drawing racial conclusions from measuring brain volumes. In his paper on "The Negroes' Brain as Compared to that of the European and the Orang-Outang"

(1837), Professor Tiedemann of Heidelberg had been led to the unambiguous conclusion that there are no significant differences between the size and the structure of the European and the Negro brain, and that the latter is in no way in a closer connection with that of the ape than the former. Zerffi should also have seen from Jena University Professor Huschke's work ("The Human and the Animal Skull, Brain, and Mind, according to Age, Sex and Race", 1854), that contemporary science regarded "anthropological anatomy", based on the comparison of the brain volumes of different peoples, a "terra incognita" and a "tabula rasa", with incidental recording of individual differences without any real scientific observations. Dr. Broca, professor of anthropology in Paris, was also doubtful about raising the question whether the superiority and the inferiority of peoples or races depended on the forms or on the volumes of their brains.⁷⁰

Why then did Zerffi persist, in spite of an almost unanimous reservation on the part of contemporary scientific authorities, in his cranio-metrical "evidences?" The contradiction seems to have been solved in the first volume of the *Studies*. For the first and for the last time, the author explains here that "the superior intellectual powers ... [of] ... the English, German, and Americans ... [have] always had a salutary influence on the progressive development of humanity. The Aryan or Teutonic race, endowed with the highest amount of brain, has continually though unconsciously followed out this impulse by an inherent force of greater intellect. This general remark ... will serve as an explanation of the colonising power which distinguishes the Teuton races, and which power is totally wanting in the Roman and French races." Again, and this time directly, with all the "evidence" taken from craniometry, Zerffi's racial theory serves the ideology of expressly and almost exclusively, British colonialism. As we see it, the irrational elements in Zerffi's historical theory can be traced back, if only in part, to a kind of conscious adaptation to British imperial ideology.⁷¹

It seems a basic feature in Zerffi's oeuvre as a historian that he resiliently and resourcefully adopted the dominant, and sometimes the most dangerous, intellectual trends of the day. He zealously devoted his great lexical knowledge, his theoretical sensitivity, and his ability for abstraction as well as his linguistic and personal experiences to the service of his new country, while he also tried to meet the demands of the Japanese. It was due partly to an almost unconditional acceptance of the rather contradictory ideology of "Victorianism", and partly to his cosmopolitan ability to make the most of any intellectual trend in fashion that he was rapidly able to become integrated in British society and was able to achieve relative popularity as well as success as an "organizer", lecturer and professional writer of history.

Since Zerffi, as far as we know, left no documentary heritage, we have been able to base our analysis of his historical oeuvre only on his works which appeared in print. In a number of cases, as for example his continuing profession of racial theory and German cultural superiority, we had

thus to resort to hypotheses as regards the precise causes and the background of the contradictions in his works. His contradictory career as a historian was characterized as much by an almost permanent discrepancy between slogan-like principles and actual historiographical practice, as by a series of grave theoretical and methodological errors and inconsistencies, though this is not to say that there were not achievements of doubtless significance and interest. When reading his works, it is often difficult unambiguously to decide whether he was, by contemporary measures, a popularizer of science, or an unscientific propagandist. One thing, however, is obvious. Not only had he served a wrong cause as a "politician", by working for the Austrian secret service, but also he propagated, as a scholar, harmful intellectual trends and dangerous theories. He sought to explain man's destiny with the changing relationship of morals and intellect, while he himself suffered from a chronic imbalance of these forces. However, Zerffi did exert some sort of influence on the public which made him, an irresponsible author, one who was rather dangerous as well. By popularizing certain irrational, reactionary and aggressive ideas and theories, he ultimately though indirectly paved the way for the inhuman ideology of fascism. The oeuvre of this not entirely savoury man can be regarded as a repulsive episode in the history of 19th century scholarship. At the same time, it is illustrative of a possible and not infrequent variety of the mechanism of mass influence, contributing to the new ideology in Japan, of the main historico-theoretical and methodological trends of the century.

NOTES

¹ *Pál, Lajos*, Rónay Jácint, Századok 105, 1971, 670 – 695; *Zádor, Anna*, Henszlmann Imre emlékezete (In Memory of Imre Henszlmann), Magyar Tudomány IX, 1964, 63 – 69; *Levárdy, Ferenc*, Henszlmann alkotó egyénisége (The Creative Self of Henszlmann), Művészettörténeti Értesítő XVIII, 1969, 193 – 200; *Pogányiné, Balás Edit*, Pulszky Ferenc, Művészettörténeti Értesítő XVIII, 1969, 201 – 203.

² Zerffi was first mentioned as a historian in Japanese historiography. A more thorough treatment was first given to him by *Imai Toshiki*, Seyoshigaku no Honpo-shigaku ni ataeru eikyo (The Effect of Western European Historical Research on our Historical Scholarship), in: Honpo-shigaku-shi Ron-so, Ge-kan. Nihon-shigakkai hen (Studies in the History of our Historical Scholarship, 2. Published by the Japanese Historical Society, Tokyo, Fuzan-bo, 1939, 1439 – 1469; and, partly on the basis of this study, by *Numata Jiro*, Meiji-shoki ni okeru Seyoshigaku no yunyu ni tsuite – Shigeno Yasutsugu to G. G. Zerffi, "The Science of History" (The Introduction of European Historical Scholarship at the Beginning of the Meiji Era – Shigeno Yasutsugu and G. G. Zerffi's The Science of History), in: *Ito Tasaburo* (ed.), Kokumin Seikatsu-shi Kenkyu (Studies on the Life of the Nation), 3, Tokyo, Yoshikawa-kobunkan, 1958, 401 – 429; as well as by *Numata Jiro*, Shigeno Yasutsugu and the Modern Tokyo Tradition of History Writing, in: *W. G. Beasley – E. G. Pulleyblank* (eds.), Historical Writing on the Peoples of Asia, III: Historians of China and Japan, London, Oxford UP, 1961, repr. 1962; 264 – 287. His paper provided the basis for the first comprehensive sketch on Zerffi's life and works, by *Arnaldo Momigliano*, Da G. G. Zerffi a Ssu-ma Ch'ien, Rivista Storica Italiana LXXVI, 1964, 1058 – 1065, raising and answering a number of questions. Zerffi's career as a whole is discussed by the present author in a dissertation, the following parts of which were already published in English: *Tibor Frank*, Hungarian Art-Historian in Victorian Britain: Gustavus George Zerffi, Acta Historiae Artium Acad. Sci. Hung. 23,

- 1977, 121–134; *Tibor Frank*, "Dogma and Science": Patterns of Victorian Unbelief, *Studies in English and American* 3, Budapest: L. Eötvös University, 1977, 61–95. — Since the present study is also part of the author's dissertation, some problems are only touched upon here.
- ³ *Kiss, József*, A Nemzeti Dal egykorú fordítói és fordításai (Contemporary Translators and Translations of the National Song), in: Lukácsy, Sándor and Varga, János (eds.), *Petőfi és kora* (Petőfi and his Times) Budapest, Akadémiai Kiadó, 1970, 434–460; *József Kiss*, Petőfi in der deutschsprachigen Presse Ungarns vor der Märzrevolution, in: *Studien zur Geschichte der deutsch-ungarischen literarischen Beziehungen*, Berlin, Akademie V., 1969, 290–292; *Pándi, Pál*, "Kisértetjárás" Magyarországon. Az utópista szocialista és kommunista eszmék jelentkezése a reformkorban ("Phantoms" in Hungary. Utopian Socialist and Communist Ideas in the Reform Period) Budapest, Magvető K., 1972, I, 298, 349, 431, 496, II, 48, 57, 199, 218, 353, 372, 408, 453.
- ⁴ See *Nádaskai, Lajos* on Zerffi, *Honderű* 6, 1848, No. 13, 203; *Bajza, József* on Zerffi, *Kossuth Hírlapja*, 12 Dec. 1848, 615; Zerffi's speech at the general assembly of the Egalitarian Society on 20 Aug. 1848, *Népelem*, 23–24 Aug., 1848, 178, 183. — The applications for captaincy, together with the enclosures to it, of Gusztáv Zerffi to Minister of Defence Lázár Mészáros, 17 Febr. and 7 March, 1849 and the draft of his appointment, 23 Febr. 1849, Magyar Országos Levéltár (The National Archives of Hungary, hereinafter OL), 1848–49-i Hadügyminisztérium, Általános Iratok (Ministry of Defence, 1848–49, General Papers), H 75, Group 73, No. 4149. — General József Schweidel to the Minister of Defence, Pest, 23 May, 1849, and the draft of the answer, 31. May, 1849, OL, H 75, Group 121, No. 16.356. — Zerffi to Kossuth, Belgrade, 17 Sept. 1849, OL, Kossuth-gyűjtemény (K. Collection), R 90, I 539; Zerffi to Kossuth, London, 28 Jan. 1854, published by *Abafi, Lajos*, A magyar emigráció történetéhez (On the history of the Hungarian emigration), *Házánk* II, 1884, 388–389. — *Kovács, József László*, "...elfogattatás végett köröztetik..." (Petőfi, Kossuth s más írók és forradalmárok közös körözlevele 1849 szeptemberéből) ("... a warrant has been issued for the arrest of..." (A common warrant against Petőfi, Kossuth and other writers and revolutionary personalities, from September 1849), *Alföld* XXIV, 1973, 78–80.
- ⁵ See Notes 2 and 3, and *G. G. Zerffi*, *Faust*, von J. W. Goethe. With Critical and Explanatory Notes. London, Simpkin, Marshall and Co., 1859; London: Nutt, 1862, cover pages; his citizenship is documented in the Public Record Office (PRO), London, under HO 1/107/3964. For his activities as a lecturer on history see *G. G. Zerffi* to W. Herbage, 24 March 1881, Royal Historical Society Archives, H3(1); John Robertson to Mrs T. E. Ellis, 22 November 1909, National Library of Wales (NLW), Aberystwyth, Cardiganshire, Wales, D. R. Daniel Papers, 31/3; and *G. G. Zerffi*, *Studies in the Science of General History*. London: Hirschfeld, 1887–1889, I/IV. Also cf. *R. Várkonyi, Ágnes*, A pozitívista történetelmélet a magyar történetírásban (Positivism in Hungarian History-Writing) Budapest, Akadémiai Kiadó, 1973, II, 256–7. — I am indebted to P. A. Brand (PRO), N. C. Masterman (University College, Swansea, Wales) and B. G. Owens (NLW) for the assistance they gave in tracing the documents.
- ⁶ There is a detailed analysis of Zerffi's art history in my above mentioned study: "Victorian Art-Historian...", 121–134. For the Hungarian historiography in the Reform Period see *R. Várkonyi, Ágnes*, op. cit. II, 17–223.
- ⁷ *R. A. Humphreys*, The Royal Historical Society 1868–1968. London: RHS, 1969, 1–14. — Humphreys' figures on the membership of the Society do not quite correspond with those published at the beginning of the contemporary volumes of the Transactions of the RHS. His rather sketchy description of the conditions of British history-writing at the time can be complemented by *G. P. Gooch*, *History and Historians in the Nineteenth Century*. London, Longmans, Green and Co., 1928⁴, 340–401; cf. its new and revised German edition: *Geschichte und Geschichtsschreiber im 19. Jahrhundert*. Frankfurt a. M.: S. Fischer, 1964, 362–426. Recently, *K. B. Vinogradov*, *Očerki anglijskoy istoriografii novovo i novejshevo vremeni*. Leningrad, Izd. Leningr. Univ., 1975², 47–55.
- ⁸ *G. G. Zerffi*, "On the Possibility of a Strictly Scientific Treatment of Universal History", *Transactions of the RHS* III, 1874, 380–394; *G. G. Zerffi*, "Immanuel Kant in his Relation to Modern History", *Transactions of the RHS* IV, 1876, 75–96; *G. G. Zerffi*,

- "The Historical Development of Idealism and Realism", Transactions of the RHS V, 1877, 117–143; VI, 1877, 304–323; VII, 1878, 130–154; VIII, 1880, 331–355.
- ⁹ In revealing the Japanese links relating to Zerffi's career I was given valuable assistance by Professor Nishizawa Ryusei, University of Tsukuba, Institute of History and Anthropology. I received further help in treating Japanese literature from Tashiro Fumio and Dr Judit Hidasi. Grateful thanks are due to all three of them.
- ¹⁰ On the Meiji restoration in general see *Paul Akamatsu*, Meiji—1868. Révolution et contre-révolution au Japon. Paris, Calmann—Lévy, 1968; *W. G. Beasley*, The Meiji Restoration. Stanford UP, 1972. For the reorganization of historical scholarship at the time of the Meiji see *Abe Makoto*, 'Suematsu Kencho to Zerffi, "The Science of History"', (Suematsu Kencho and Zerffi's The Science of History), in: *Rekishigaku—Kenkyu* (Researches in Historical Science), 3–4, Tokyo, Aoki Shoten, 1935, 347; *Imai Toshiki*, op. cit. 1441–2; *Numata Jiro* (1961), op. cit. 265–9, 273; and *Iwai Tadakuma*, *Nihon-kindai shigaku-shi no Keisei* (The Development of Modern Historical Science in Japan), in: *Nihon Rekishi. Bekkan I* (The History of Japan. Supplementary Volume I) Tokyo, Iwanami Shoten, 1966, 83.
- ¹¹ *Okubo Toshiaki*, 'Zerffi no "Shigaku" to Iwakura Tomomi. Meiji Shigaku-shi no ichi-bun' (Zerffi's "The Science of History" and Iwakura Tomomi. An Episode from the History of Historical Scholarship at the Time of the Meiji). *Nihon Rekishi* (The History of Japan), 118, Tokyo, Yoshikawa-kobunkan, 1958, 52–3; *Abe Makoto*, op. cit. 347; *Numata Jiro* (1958), op. cit. 405–6, 409–410; *Numata Jiro* (1961), op. cit. 274–5. Cf. *G. G. Zerffi*, The Science of History. London, privately printed as ms., 1879, III–VIII.
- ¹² *G. G. Zerffi*, The Historical Development of Idealism and Realism, Transactions of the RHS V, 1877, 118–121, 142–3; VI, 1877, 311, 314, 323; VII, 1878, 143, 152; VIII, 1880, 333–6, 338, 355. Cf. *F. A. Lange*, Geschichte des Materialismus und Kritik seiner Bedeutung in der Gegenwart, I–II. Iserlohn, Baedeker, 1873–1875; *Kuno Fischer*, Geschichte der neueren Philosophie. Mannheim, 1854.
- ¹³ *G. G. Zerffi*, Science, op. cit. III–XIII; *Imai Toshiki*, op. cit. 445; *Numata Jiro* 1958, op. cit. 422; *Numata Jiro* 1961, op. cit. 276; Ito Hirobumi kankei Monjo, 5 (Documents of the Life of Ito Hirobumi, 5) Tokyo, Hanawa Shobo, 1977, 365, 369–70, 374–5. — According to *Numata*, Suematsu received 1500 from the 30,000 yens that was the annual budget of the Historiographical Institute, for the publication of Zerffi's book, and £ 348 afterwards. The translation cost the Institute 591 yens. These sums were fairly considerable at the time.
- ¹⁴ *G. G. Zerffi*, Science, op. cit. III–VIII.
- ¹⁵ *Ibid.*, IX–XIII.
- ¹⁶ *Imai Toshiki*, op. cit. 1444–5; *Numata Jiro* (1958), op. cit. 412; *Numata Jiro* (1961), op. cit. 276; *A. Momigliano*, op. cit. 1063.
- ¹⁷ *J. Bronowski—Bruce Mazlish*, The Western Intellectual Tradition. From Leonardo to Hegel. Harmondsworth, Middx, Penguin, 1963, 539–542.
- ¹⁸ *G. G. Zerffi*, Science, op. cit. 1, 4, 53, 416, 705, 760.
- ¹⁹ *Ibid.*, 2–3, 29–33, 526, 554, 593, 770–2.
- ²⁰ *Ibid.*, 19, 148–9, 391, 593, 597, 607–9, 614, 631, 644.
- ²¹ *R. Várkonyi, Ágnes*, op. cit. I, 58–60, 69–72, 76, 115–6, 128–131; *R. Várkonyi, Ágnes*, "Buckle és a magyar polgári történetírás" (Buckle and Hungarian Bourgeois History-Writing), Századok 97, 1963, 614, 620–2, 625–6, 628–9; *I. S. Kon*, Die Geschichtsphilosophie des 20. Jahrhunderts. Kritischer Abriss, Berlin, Akademie V., 1964, I, 46–53; *V. F. Aszmusz*, Marx és a polgári historizmus (Marx and Bourgeois Historicism) Budapest, Gondolat, 1973, 106–120; *Elekes, Lajos*, A történelem felfogása korunk polgári tudományában (The Concept of History in Modern Bourgeois Scholarship) Budapest, Kossuth K., 1975, 98, 102; *Walter E. Houghton*, The Victorian Frame of Mind, 1830–1870. New Haven, Yale UP; London, Oxford UP, 1957, 145–146, 149–150. *W. R. Sorley*, A History of British Philosophy. Cambridge UP, repr. 1965, 277–8; *H. Grisewood* (ed.), Ideas and Beliefs of the Victorians. London, Sylvan Press, 1949, 151, 166, 34.
- ²² *H. T. Buckle*, History of Civilization in England, I. London, Parker and Son, 1857, 6–8, 16–18, 206.

- ²³ *Ibid.*, 282–4 and *passim*; G. G. Zerffi, *Science*, op. cit. 502, 575–6, and 78, 92, 256, 461, 491–7, 623–4, 635, 702–3, 769. Cf. W. Draper, *History of the Conflict between Religion and Science*. London, 1875., and Tibor Frank, "Dogma and Science" . . . op. cit. 61–95.
- ²⁴ R. Várkonyi, Ágnes, A pozitívista történetiszemlélet . . . , op. cit. I, 90–96, 156–159; R. Várkonyi, Ágnes, "Buckle . . .", op. cit. 616, 618, 625–6; J. M. Robertson, *Buckle and His Critics*. London, 1895; G. A. Wells, "The Critics of Buckle", *Past and Present*, April 1956, 75–89; Giles R. Saint Aubyn, *A Victorian Eminence. The Life and Works of H. T. Buckle*. London, 1958; Elekes, Lajos, op. cit. 107–9; for the attacks on Zerffi see Note 59.
- ²⁵ Cf. Tibor Frank, "Dogma and Science" . . . , op. cit. 61–95.
- ²⁶ G. G. Zerffi, *Science*, op. cit. 3–17, 59, 490–1, 646, 769–771.
- ²⁷ *Ibid.*, 17, and 3–4, 14, 489–490, 509–511.
- ²⁸ For the relationship between morals and intellect, see H. T. Buckle, op. cit. Chapter IV, 153–206; G. G. Zerffi, "On the Possibility . . .", op. cit. 387–8. Cf. R. Várkonyi, Ágnes, A pozitívista történetiszemlélet . . . , op. cit. I, 44–5. — Zerffi's theory of the static and dynamic powers (which he calls respectively morals and intellect), may be connected, with quite similar elements in Comte's social theory. See on this Zsigmond, László, Claude-Henri de Saint-Simon. A XIX. század politikai gondolkodásának történetéből (C.-H. de S.-S. From the History of 19th Century Political Thought). Budapest, Akadémiai K., 1977, 192–241; Kulcsár, Kálmán, A szociológiai gondolkodás fejlődése (The Development of Sociological Thinking) Budapest, Akadémiai K., 1971², 49–63. Buckle may not have been the only source for Zerffi's theory of conflict between intellect and morals as a basic principle of history. Right before the revolution of 1848, Pál Vasvári had arrived at almost the same conclusions: "Two parallel tracks are necessary for the train of mankind to progress continually and yet without danger. One is morality, the other erudition. . . the iron tracks of erudition must be laid down *parallelly* with the ancient line of morality!" As "excerpts" from Vasvári's introductory passage to his projected but never completed "Történeti né. tár" (Historical Inventory), these ideas were published by Életképek, Vol. 4, 12–19 Dec. 1847, 741–7, 773–7, for the quotation see 745–6. Zerffi most probably read this article, as it was published at a time when Életképek was constantly attacking his paper *Honderű* and his very person as well. Cf. R. Várkonyi, Ágnes, A pozitívista történet szemlélet . . . , op. cit. II, 213–223. — I am indebted to Dr Á. R. Várkonyi for kind and useful advice and criticism.
- ²⁹ G. G. Zerffi, *Science*, op. cit. 26–7, 448. For the demand in contemporary historiography for summarizing efforts see Elekes, Lajos, op. cit. 188–191. Although his writing before 1848 also had a "European outlook", it was most probably what he experienced during the revolution and War of Independence, and as an émigré, that widened the horizons, like those of most of his fellow-countrymen, of his thinking both in space and time. Cf. R. Várkonyi, Ágnes, op. cit. II, 239–244.
- ³⁰ G. G. Zerffi, *Science*, op. cit. 524–5.
- ³¹ *Ibid.* 54, 65–8, 70–1, 139–140, 145, 150–1, 222, 225, 633. Cf. Tibor Frank, *Hungarian Art-Historian* . . . , op. cit. 130–1.
- ³² G. G. Zerffi, *Science*, op. cit. 226–248, 236–9, 282–3, 291, 327–8, 385. Cf. Tibor Frank, *Hungarian Art-Historian* . . . , op. cit. 131–2.
- ³³ G. G. Zerffi, *Science*, op. cit. 55–6, 61–3, 503–4, 525, 527–530, 540; G. G. Zerffi, *On the Possibility* . . . , op. cit. 390–394. Cf. Tibor Frank, *Hungarian Art-Historian* . . . , op. cit. 130–2.
- ³⁴ V. F. Aszmosz, op. cit. 113–4; Lendvai, L. Ferenc–Nyíri, J. Kristóf, *A filozófia rövid története* (A Short History of Philosophy) Budapest, Kossuth K., 1974, 164–166; A. Momigliano, op. cit. 1063.
- ³⁵ Cf. Tibor Frank, *Hungarian Art-Historian* . . . , op. cit. 131–132.
- ³⁶ Klaus Dockhorn, *Der deutsche Historismus in England*. Göttingen, Vandenhoeck u. Ruprecht, 1950, 15–78; Klaus Dockhorn, *Deutscher Geist und angelsächsische Geistesgeschichte. Ein Versuch der Deutung ihres Verhältnisses*. Göttingen–Frankfurt–Berlin, Musterschmidt, 1954, 31–3.
- ³⁷ G. G. Zerffi, *Faust*, von J. W. Goethe, op. cit. 2nd ed., (1862), XXXII.

- ³⁹ *G. G. Zerffi*, Science, op. cit. 635; 615; 104–5; 247–8, 706; 241, 297–8; 186–7, 312, 505, 520; 4–6; 445; 467; 513; 706; 292, 372; 621; 530. — *Klaus Dockhorn* (1950), op. cit. 24–6, 155–160, 72–8, 115–122, 123–171; *Klaus Dockhorn* (1954), op. cit. 31–3, 36–9, 42–7. Cf. *G. G. Iggers*, The German Conception of History. The National Tradition of Historical Thought from Herder to the Present. Middletown, Conn., Wesleyan UP, 1968, 6; *Elekes, Lajos*, op. cit. 125–6, 129–139, 155; *K. B. Vinogradov*, op. cit. 55–59.
- ⁴⁰ On the reactionary German ideologies of the 19th century see *Georg Lukács*, Die Zerstörung der Vernunft. (Werke, Band 9) Neuwied – Berlin Luchterhand, 1962 and *Szamuely, Tibor*, A németországi fasizmus történeti előzményeiről és ideológiájáról (On the Historical Preliminaries and the Ideology of Fascism in Germany) Történelmi Szemle V, 1962, 505–510. — For the links between the trends of positivism and historicism see *R. Várkonyi, Ágnes*, op. cit. I, 151–6.
- ⁴¹ For the relationship between Zerffi and the Nationalverein see *Tibor Frank*, Marx and Hungary: A Missing Link (1852–1853), Austrian History Yearbook, 1982 (in press); *Karl Marx – Friedrich Engels*, Werke 30. Berlin, Dietz, 1964, Notes No. 22, 203, 209, 225; Zerffi to Kinkel, London, 7, 10 and 22 Sept. 1863, copy in the Universitätsbibliothek, Bonn, Handschriftenabteilung, S 2675 (26). — *John Morley's* article „France and Germany”, The Fortnightly Review, Sept. 1870, 369–370, is quoted by *Andrea Suján*, British Views on the Franco-Prussian War, in: Az Angol TDK Évkönyve 1975–76. Budapest: ELTE, 1976, 196.
- ⁴² *G. G. Zerffi*, Science, op. cit. 746–767, esp. 747, 750–1, 763, 767. Cf. *Imai Toshiki*, op. cit. 1444; *David Mathew*, Lord Acton and His Times. London, Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1968, 329–335; *G. P. Gooch*, op. cit. 385.
- ⁴³ *G. G. Zerffi*, Science, op. cit. 729–746, esp. 739–40, 743.
- ⁴⁴ Civilization in Hungary: Seven Answers to the Seven Letters Addressed by M. Barth. De Szemere... to Richard Cobden... By an Hungarian. London, Trübner and Co., 1860, 163–225. A proof of Zerffi's authorship is, in the first place, in the pamphlet “The Emperor of Austria versus Louis Kossuth: A few words of common sense”, published also by Trübner and Co. in 1861 anonymously, only mentioning that the author was the same as that of *Civilization in Hungary*. In the latter pamphlet, Zerffi was offering his assistance to Austria in the Kossuth-note case in London in 1861, and the author sent it, enclosed with a letter written in his own hand, to Emperor Francis Joseph himself (23 April 1861, Haus-, Hof- und Staatsarchiv, Ministerium des Äußern, Informationsbüro, Actes de Haute Police, Karton 57). Further and indirect proofs to his authorship are presented in my dissertation.
- ⁴⁵ *John Acton*, Mr. Buckle's Philosophy of History, Rambler, 1858, repr. in: *Lord Acton*, Essays in the Liberal Interpretation of History. Chicago–London, University of Chicago Press, 1967, 28–9; *R. Várkonyi, Ágnes*, op. cit. I, 114; *Elekes, Lajos*, op. cit. 106; *Georg Lukács*, op. cit. 579, 591. In connection with his manual on art history, I have written in detail on the sources of Zerffi's racism, cf. *Tibor Frank*, “Hungarian Art-Historian...”, op. cit. 130–2.
- ⁴⁶ *G. G. Zerffi*, Science, op. cit. 540; *G. G. Zerffi*, “On the Possibility...”, op. cit. 390; *G. G. Zerffi*, Studies on the Science of General History, op. cit. I, 10. Cf. *A. Momigliano*, op. cit. 1063–4.
- ⁴⁷ *G. G. Zerffi*, Science, op. cit. 8, 45, 47, 72, 226, 725, 736.
- ⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, 620; *L. E. Elliott – Binns*, Religion in the Victorian Era. London, Lutterworth, 1946², 274–5.
- ⁴⁹ *Klaus Dockhorn* (1954), op. cit. 42–3, 46–7; *H. Grisewood* (ed.), op. cit. 50–51, 33–34, 38; *J. Bronowski – Bruce Mazlish*, op. cit. 539–542; *V. F. Aszmosz*, op. cit. 128–142; *Lendvai, L. Ferenc – Nyíri, J. Kristóf*, op. cit. 153–168; *W. R. Sorley*, op. cit. 242–3, 267–270, 286–290, 295–9; *H. T. Buckle*, Geschichte der Civilisation in England. Deutsch von *Arnold Ruge*. Leipzig u. Heidelberg, Winter, 1881⁶, IX–XIII.
- ⁵⁰ *G. G. Iggers*, op. cit. 32, 29–40, 80, 101–5, 132; *Elekes, Lajos*, op. cit. 124–8, 131–4.
- ⁵¹ For positivist evolutionary theories see *R. Várkonyi, Ágnes*, op. cit. I, 49, 103, 121; *I. S. Kon*, Die Geschichtsphilosophie, op. cit. I, 33–7; *Elekes, Lajos*, op. cit. 104–115. — I went into detail on Zerffi's vulgar Darwinism in my above quoted studies, “Hungarian Art-Historian...”, op. cit. 126–7; and “Dogma and Science...”, op. cit. 66–7, 86–7.

- ⁵¹ *Georg Lukács*, op. cit. 22. Cf. *G. G. Zerffi*, "Immanuel Kant...", op. cit. 94.
- ⁵² *G. G. Zerffi*, Science, op. cit. 65, 183-7, 287-8, 339, 372, 377, 444-7, 504-9, 548, 635; for his demand for the historian's impartiality, 35-6, 75, 180, 189, 191, 204-5, 242, 303, 370, 456, 722-3.
- ⁵³ *Imai Toshiki*, op. cit. 1444-5; *Okubo Toshiaki*, op. cit. 52-3; *Numata Jiro* (1961), op. cit. 275-6, 278; *Iwai Tadakuma*, op. cit. 83. Suematsu's later career is described here following information received from Professor Nishizawa Ryusei. - I have not, as yet, come across any contemporary British, German, or Japanese criticism on this work of Zerffi.
- ⁵⁴ *Ozawa Eichichi*, Niho-shigaku-shi no Kenkyu. Meiji-hen (Studies in the History of Modern Japanese Historical Scholarship. The Age of the Meiji). Tokyo, Yoshikawa-kobunkan, 1968, 380-3, 388-9.
- ⁵⁵ *Imai Toshiki*, op. cit. 1448.
- ⁵⁶ *G. G. Zerffi*, "The Science of History". Inaugural Address, 13 Nov. 1879, Transactions of the RHS IX, 1881, 1-20.
- ⁵⁷ RHS: Report of the Council, Session 1880-1. Transactions of the RHS X, 1882, Appendix 3; *R. A. Humphreys*, op. cit. 14.
- ⁵⁸ *R. A. Humphreys*, op. cit. 14-19.
- ⁵⁹ The Greenock Telegraph and Clyde Shipping Gazette, 11 Oct., 11 Nov. 1881; The Press and St James's Chronicle, 22 Oct. 1881. Cf. *R. A. Humphreys*, op. cit. 19.
- ⁶⁰ *G. G. Zerffi* to William Herbage, London, 18 Febr., 24 March 1881 (two letters with the same date; enclosed within the official one is a further one of private and confidential character); Lord Aberdare to *G. G. Zerffi*, 14 Febr. 1881. Royal Historical Society Archives, H3/1/1. I wish to acknowledge my gratitude to former President of the RHS Professor *R. A. Humphreys*, to former Secretary of the RHS *A. G. Watson*, and to *D. L. Jones* (University of London), who assisted me in studying the Zerffi correspondence held in the RHS Archives. - It is regrettable that there is no correspondence on Zerffi in the Aberdare Papers, held partly in Britain (Glamorgan Record Office, Cardiff, Glamorgan), and partly by the Huntington Library (San Marino, California) (on information kindly offered by *Patricia Moore*, GRO and *Mary L. Robertson*, Huntington).
- ⁶¹ *William Herbage* to *G. G. Zerffi*, 23 Dec. 1880, 10, 26 Jan., 10, 25, Febr., 16, 21, 23, 24 March 1881. Royal Historical Society Archives, Letter Book, H3/1/3. Cf. *R. A. Humphreys* op. cit. 19-22; *G. P. Gooch*, op. cit. 340-401.
- ⁶² *G. G. Zerffi*, "Voltaire, in his Relation to the Study of General History, from a Philosophical Point of View", Read 21 July 1881, Transactions of the RHS X, 1882, 344-370, esp. 344, 357-8, 367-9. Cf. *John Passmore*, A Hundred Years of Philosophy. Harmondsworth, Middx, Penguin, repr. 1972, 57.
- ⁶³ *G. G. Zerffi*, "The 'Iklik', by Hamdani". Read Febr. 1882, Transactions of the RHS, N. S. I, 1884, 70-83; cf. *Germanus, Gyula*, Az arab irodalom története. (A History of Arabic Literature) Budapest, Gondolat K., 1973², 148. - *G. G. Zerffi*, "Hungary under King Matthias Hunyady, surnamed 'Corvinus' 1458-1490", Read Dec. 1882, Transactions of the RHS, N. S. I, 1884, 260-272, esp. 260-3. Cf. *Tibor Frank*, The British Image of Hungary 1865/1870. Budapest, L. Eötvös University, 1976, 172-3, 182-3.
- ⁶⁴ *G. G. Zerffi*, "The Tchōng-Yōng of Confucius, Edited by his Grandson, Tchhing-Tsé", Read 21 Febr. 1884, Transactions of the RHS, N. S. II, 1885, 254-271, esp. 255-6. Cf. *Sir Richard Temple*, Political Lessons of Chinese History, Transactions of the RHS, N. S. I, 1884, 205-229; and *Tōkei, Ferenc-Miklós, Pál*, A kínai irodalom rövid története. (A Short History of Chinese Literature) Budapest, Gondolat K., 1960, 26-7.
- ⁶⁵ Bibliographical Notices, Transactions of the RHS, N. S. I, 1884, 273-4. - For Baron Helfert, a loyal and conservative politician and historiographer, see *Österreichisches Biographisches Lexikon 1815-1950*, II. Graz-Köln, Böhlau Nachf., 1959, 256-7. - If what I assume is right, in criticizing Helfert, Zerffi was in part opposing himself, since one of the chief sources of Helfert's book (especially of its chapters on Kossuth) was a work by Bertalan Szemere, the editing of which in 1852 and 1853, was also assisted by Zerffi himself as a translator and probably also as an informer against Kossuth. Cf. *Helfert*, op. cit. Vol. IV/1, 216-255, and Appendix 99-109; *Bartholomäus Szemere*, Graf Ludwig Batthyány, Arthur Görgei, Ludwig Kossuth. Politische Charakterkitzen aus dem Ungarischen Freiheitskriege. Hamburg, Hoffmann und Campe, 1853. For the

correspondence of Zerffi and Szemere (and for Szemere's work) see Országos Széchényi Könyvtár Kézirattára (hereinafter OSzK Kt), Levelestár (The MS Collection of the National Széchényi Library, Letter Coll.) and Egyetemi Könyvtár Kézirattára, Budapest (hereinafter EK Kt) (Library of the University of Budapest, MS Collection), Litt. Orig. 584/1; on the same topic further see the correspondence between János Bangya and Bertalan Szemere (1851–2), OSzK Kt and EK Kt: Litt. Orig. 583/7–28. Remarks as well as fierce attacks against Austria can be found in other works by G. G. Zerffi, too, see e.g. his *Spiritualism and Animal Magnetism*. London, Hardwicke, 1875², IV–V; "The Eastern Question". London, Sunday Lecture Society, 1877, 21; "The Irish Question in History". London, Crystal Palace and Simpkin, Marshall and Co., 1887, 20–21. Already in 1860, Zerffi's wife anonymously published an article ("An Austrian Employé") in the then newly launched *The Cornhill Magazine*, Vol. I, 736–741, making a wicked satire about Viennese bureaucracy. Sharply opposing the Austrian system, the authoress also referred to espionage, right at the beginning of the article: "...the Government ... wants spies, not confidence." The authorship was revealed in *The Wellesley Index to Victorian Periodicals 1824–1900*, ed. W. E. Houghton. Toronto, University of Toronto Press; London, Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1966, I, 326.

⁶⁶ G. G. Zerffi, "Past and Present in the East", in: *Evolution in History, Language, and Science*. Four addresses delivered at the Commencement of the twenty fifth session, 1884–85, of the Crystal Palace Company's School of Art, Science, and Literature. London: Crystal Palace Co., 1884, 1–46, esp. 10, 22–31, 32–7, 41–2, 45–6.

⁶⁷ G. G. Zerffi, "The Irish Question in History", op. cit. 1–24, esp. 20–1. Cf. *Tibor Frank*, *The British Image of Hungary 1865/1870*, op. cit. 194–5, 220–1.

⁶⁸ G. G. Zerffi, *Studies in the Science of General History*, Vol. I: *Ancient History*. London, Hirschfeld, 1887, Vol. II: *Mediaeval History*. London, Hirschfeld, 1889, I, 6 and *passim*.

⁶⁹ G. G. Zerffi, *Studies*, op. cit. I, 9–11, 43–4, 64, 151, 212–3.

⁷⁰ G. G. Zerffi, *Studies*, op. cit. I, 212; Dr. Friedrich Tiedemann, *Das Hirn des Negers mit dem des Europäers und Orang-Outangs verglichen*. Heidelberg, Winter, 1837, 63–4; Emil Huschke, *Schaedel, Hirn und Seele des Menschen und der Thiere nach Alter, Geschlecht und Race. Dargestellt nach neuen Methoden und Untersuchungen*. Jena, Mauke, 1854, 71; Paul Broca, "Histoire des travaux de la Société d'Anthropologie, (1859–1863)", in: *Paul Broca, Mémoires d'Anthropologie*, II. Paris, Reinwald, 1874, 445.

⁷¹ G. G. Zerffi, *Studies*, op. cit. I, 63, II, 155.